



---

**State of Vermont**  
**Vermont Department of Education**  
120 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05620-2501

September 2010

Re: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Survey Results

To Whom It May Concern:

In December 2009, principals and superintendents were surveyed regarding their districts' teacher and principal evaluation practices. Some of the information gathered in these surveys was required as a condition of the state's acceptance of federal Stimulus Funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). However, the Vermont Department of Education asked additional questions in order to gain as complete a picture as possible of the current state of teacher and principal evaluation practices in Vermont. The results for the ARRA-required questions can be found at: [http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/dept/recovery\\_act/sfsf.html#eval\\_survey](http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/dept/recovery_act/sfsf.html#eval_survey).

Because the data gathered was required, we received a 100 percent response rate, which means that principals at all 308 public schools completed the teacher evaluation survey, and all 61 superintendents completed the principal evaluation survey. We are grateful to all school administrators for their support in ensuring this information was returned to us.

What follows are the cumulative findings of all the results. Text responses have been edited to remove any identifying information. Where a school or district name was indicated, it was replaced with an X. Also, text responses were sometimes reordered to connect them to the questions for which they seemed most appropriate.

It is important to remember that these findings simply provide a snapshot of the current status of teacher and principal evaluations. The goal is to consider these findings as we move toward a system of teacher and principal evaluation that is more transparent, useful and consistent statewide. Federal guidelines indicate a national movement towards including student growth measures in teacher evaluations. Our goal is to incorporate student growth as one of many measurements of teacher and administrator performance. We will be creating a statewide committee to develop an evaluation model that best reflects the values of Vermont's education system.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this document, please contact Marta Cambra, Director of Educator Quality, at (802) 828-6543 or [marta.cambra@state.vt.us](mailto:marta.cambra@state.vt.us).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Armando Vilaseca". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Armando Vilaseca, Commissioner  
Vermont Department of Education



### **Key Findings of the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Surveys**

1. Approximately 10 percent of principals reported that neither school board policy nor their master agreement defined or governed teacher evaluation. However, 60 percent of superintendents reported that neither school board policy nor a master agreement defined or governed principal evaluation.
2. Most schools use a differentiated evaluation schedule where new teachers and teachers on probation receive more frequent evaluations while experienced and high-performing teachers receive less frequent evaluations. The process and standards for these evaluations also frequently vary with experience and skill. Several principals specifically expressed concern that they must be allowed to continue this differentiated approach in order to spend more time with those teachers who need it most. In general, superintendents responded similarly regarding principal evaluation.
3. Danielson's Framework for Teaching or a local adaptation of it is currently in use by approximately 70 percent of Vermont schools for teacher evaluation. However, locally-developed models are much more prevalent for principal evaluation.
4. Only 40 percent of teachers and 28 percent of principals are currently assigned an overall summative rating as part of their evaluation process.
5. The vast majority (82.5 percent) of schools do not currently include student assessment results in their teacher evaluation process. Sixty-nine (69) percent of superintendents also indicated that they do not use these results in their assessment of principals.
6. Principals were about evenly divided in terms of their support for a consistent statewide evaluation system. Concerns were expressed whether a "one size fits all" approach will be imposed by the state which will not fit well with different schools and teachers and whether consistency is a realistic goal. On the other hand, many felt that a consistent statewide process would simplify the evaluation process for administrators and teachers and improve teaching the learning, with an important caveat that there needs to be training and calibration of evaluators. Superintendents expressed similar divisions and rationales in terms of support and reservations regarding a consistent state-wide administrator evaluation process.
7. Although no question addressed this issue specifically, a number of principals volunteered that they were new to the school or district and had no knowledge of how evaluations were done in the past or of past evaluation results for individual teachers. Similar responses were provided by several superintendents regarding principal evaluation. This finding was striking and of concern. It indicates that ensuring that an effective transition process is in place to inform incoming principals of each teacher's status and of the evaluation standards and process used should be a high priority. Similarly, an effective transition process to ensure continuity in principal evaluation should be a high-priority.

**PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS (Completed by Superintendents)  
December 2009**

- 1 What is the name of the LEA for which you are completing this survey?**
- 2 Please provide the following information for the superintendent completing this survey: (Name, Telephone #, E-mail Address).**

- 3 Do the master agreements/contracts in your LEA define or describe the principal evaluation process?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Yes	19.7%	12
No	80.3%	49

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 3.**

- 4 Do your school boards have a formal written policy governing principal evaluation?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Yes	31.1%	19
No	68.9%	42

**How much correspondence between the no's in the 2 questions (questions #3 and #4)?**

36 districts answered no for both questions #3 and #4

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 4.**

- 5 How frequently are you required to evaluate principals?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>More Than Once/Year</b>	<b>Annually</b>	<b>Every 2 Yrs</b>	<b>Every 3 Yrs</b>	<b>As Time &amp; Circumstances Permit</b>
Newly Hired Principals	7	51	0	0	3
Experienced Principals	0	48	9	0	3
High Performing Principals	1	45	6	3	3
Principals on Probation	34	18	0	0	5

or Improvement Plans

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 5.**

**6 Who is responsible for carrying out principal evaluations? (Check all that apply.)**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
School Board	4.9%	3
Superintendent	100.0%	61
Assistant Superintendent	9.8%	6
Curriculum Coordinator	3.3%	2
Special Education Director	1.6%	1
Department Chair(s)	0.0%	0
Peer Evaluation e.g. Principal to Principal or 360 Process	6.6%	4
Teachers	4.9%	3
Parents	0.0%	0
Students	0.0%	0
Other	3.3%	2

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 6.**

**7 Which choice below best describes your evaluation model?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
National Model or Commercial Program	1.6%	1
National or Commercial Program, Adapted Locally	16.4%	10
Local Model	67.2%	41
Variety of Tools as Required by Circumstances or Assignment	14.8%	9
Briefly describe the evaluation model you use.		43

Few superintendents reported using a national evaluation model for principal evaluation. Of those who indicated using or being influenced by one, the models mentioned were:

- 6 Framework for Teaching (Danielson)
- 6 ISLIC
- 6 360° (did not specify 360° model used)

- 1 Skillful Administrator
- 2 VSBA
- 1 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) (a business model)
- 1 Competencies of Professional Practice
- 1 Vermont Classroom Observation Tool (VCOT)
- 2 Research for Better Teaching

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 7.**

**8 In general, what domains or performance areas are part of a principal's evaluation. Select all that apply.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Establishment of a shared vision of high expectations for all	96.7%	59
Instructional leadership	98.4%	60
Supervision and evaluation of staff	96.7%	59
Data-based decision making	86.9%	53
Organizational management	93.4%	57
Promotion of positive school climate and culture	98.4%	60
Communication/collaboration with families/communities	100.0%	61
Ethical practice (i.e., adhering to the Code of Ethics)	78.7%	48
Self-assessment and professional growth	83.6%	51
(e.g., seeking out opportunities to grow professionally)		

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 8.**

**9 As part of their evaluation, are principals assigned a summative rating (e.g. Outstanding, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, etc.), a numerical rating, or an overall descriptor (e.g. Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, etc.)?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
No	72.1%	44
Yes	27.9%	17

**10 If you answered "YES" to Question #9 above concerning principal evaluation levels. Please indicate the NUMBER of principals at each rating level, from highest to lowest, according to their most recent evaluation.**

**11 If you answered "YES" to Question #9 above, indicate the percentage of principals at each rating level, from highest to lowest, according to their most recent evaluation.**

**12 If you answered "No" to Question #9 above concerning evaluation levels. Please select all that apply and explain how the evaluation summarizes the process and informs the principal regarding his/her overall performance.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Separate Ratings Across Multiple Domains	28.9%	13
Descriptive Narrative	86.7%	39
Narrative Summary of "360" Feedback (Feedback provided by multiple collaborators)	17.8%	8
Other	17.8%	8

**Please see appendix for text of responses to question 12.**

**13 Does your evaluation process include aggregate student assessment results, including growth measures, as a criterion in determining principal performance?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
No	68.9%	42
Yes	31.1%	19

**14 If you answered that aggregate student assessment and growth data are used as part of principal evaluations. How significantly are they weighted? Please select the range which best approximates the weighting.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>10% or Less</b>	<b>10-30%</b>	<b>30-50%</b>	<b>More Than 50%</b>	<b>Not Weighted</b>
Approximate Weight	1	5	4	0	9

**Please see appendix for text of responses to questions 13 and 14.**

**15 Is the performance evaluation for an individual principal used to determine or establish any of the following: Select all that apply.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Compensation	41.0%	25
Merit Pay	8.2%	5

Promotion	8.2%	5
Retention	73.8%	45
Individual Professional Development Plan/Goals	86.9%	53
Job Assignment (Elsewhere in the LEA)	4.9%	3
Required Improvement Plan	82.0%	50
Probation	50.8%	31
Dismissal	73.8%	45
Other (please specify)		7

**Is there overlap between the districts that choose Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Merit Pay?**

24 districts chose Retention, Probation and Dismissal

4 districts chose Probation and Dismissal

15 districts chose Retention and Dismissal

1 district chose Retention and Probation

**Text Responses to Question 15:**

- District staff development planning.
- Evaluations would be part of the entire due process package.
- I have not had to use principal evaluations for improvement plans or dismissal, but would if there was a need to do so.
- Positive feedback and acknowledgement of success in the position.
- Professional development planning for the whole administrative team.
- We typically compensate administrators based on the adjustment to the teachers' pay scale IF the administrator is successful.

**16 What are your thoughts on the usefulness of a consistent statewide principal evaluation process?**

Answer Options	Excellent Idea	Good Idea	Fair	Not Needed	Terrible Idea
Consistent Process	5	17	14	17	5

Please see appendix for text of responses to question 16.

**17 Is there anything else you wish us to know about your evaluation system? (e.g. outcomes/impact data, longevity of your current process, history of the development and adoption of your process, etc.)**

**18 Thank you very much for your time. We appreciate the effort required to complete this survey. After we compile the statewide results, we will share them with you. If you have any additional comments or questions, please add them in the box below.**

**Please see appendix for text of responses to questions 17 and 18.**

**TEACHER EVALUATION SURVEY RESULTS (Completed by Principals)  
December, 2009**

**1 What is the name of the school for which you are completing this survey?**



**2 Provide the following information for the person completing this survey (Name, Job Title or Role, Telephone #, E-mail Address).**

**3 Does your master agreement/contract define or describe the teacher evaluation process?**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
Yes	77.6%	239
No	22.4%	69

**4 Does your school board have a formal written policy governing teacher evaluation?**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
Yes	76.0%	234
No	24.0%	74

**How much correspondence between the no's in the 2 questions (questions #3 and #4)?**

33 schools answered no for both questions #3 and #4

**\*See appendix for text of written responses to questions 3 and 4.**

**5 How frequently are you required to evaluate teachers? (Respondents were asked to submit response for each row)**

Answer Options	More Than Once/Year	Annually	Every 2 Yrs	Every 3 Yrs	As Time and Circumstances Permit
Newly Hired Teachers	245	60	0	1	2
Experienced Teachers	7	103	21	162	15
High Performing Teachers	7	97	18	163	23
Teachers on Probation or Improvement Plans	266	30	0	0	12

**\*See appendix for text of written responses to question 5.**

**6 Who is responsible for carrying out teacher evaluations? Select all that apply**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
Principal	99.0%	305
Assistant Principal	28.9%	89

Curriculum Coordinator	3.2%	10
Special Education Director	0.5%	63
Superintendent	2.6%	8
Assistant Superintendent	1.3%	4
Department Chair	0.6%	2
Teacher Leader	0.6%	2
Peer Evaluation (e.g. Teacher to Teacher or 360 Process)	2.6%	8

**Other Individuals Indicated:**

- 7 Director of Guidance
- 3 Director or Assistant Director of Special Education
- 1 Colleague Consultation
- 1 School-wide Title I Coordinator
- 1 Activities Director (who is a licensed administrator)
- 1 Director of Professional Development

**7 Which choice below best describes your evaluation model?**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
National/Commercial Model (e.g. Danielson's "Framework for Teaching")	38.6%	119
National Model/Commercial, Adapted Locally	31.8%	98
Local Model	25.6%	79
Variety of Tools as Required by Circumstances or Assignment	3.9%	12

**Models mentioned**

- 122 (40%) Use the Framework for Teaching (Danielson) model
- 90 (29%) Use a Danielson hybrid, adapted locally, sometimes in concert with one of the other models below
- 75 (24%) Unable to determine roots of the local model used
- 21 (7%) Use a nationally recognized model other than Danielson

**Models mentioned other than the Framework for Teaching (Danielson) include:**

- 10 Skillful Teacher (RBT)
- 5 Observing and Analyzing Teaching (RBT)
- 8 Research for Better Teaching (did not specify ST or OAT)

- 4 System of Continuous Improvement for Professional Educators
- 1 Meaningful Faculty Evaluation: Faculty Development and Renewal (ISM)
- 1 New York City District #2's Purposeful Planning Model
- 2 Hunter
- 1 Carl Glickman
- 1 Barker/Searchwell
- 1 William Rebus
- 1 Breaking Ranks in the Middle (NASSP)
- Several walk-through protocols (Downey, Three Minute)

**8 Identify what domains or performance areas are part of a teacher's evaluation. Select all that apply.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Communication/collaboration with parents	89.3%	275
Self-assessment and professional growth (e.g., seeking out opportunities to grow professionally)	90.6%	279
Content knowledge	93.8%	289
Curriculum planning	92.5%	285
Instructional delivery	98.7%	304
Developing & implementing assessments	89.0%	274
Using varied forms of assessment information to modify instruction to meet individual needs	87.7%	270
Classroom management	98.4%	303
Leadership and collaboration	82.1%	253
Ethical practice (e.g., adhering to the Code of Ethics)	62.3%	192
Other	13.6%	42

**Other Domains Indicated:**

- 14 Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport/ Positive Classroom Environment
- 11 Contributing to School/District/Implementing Action Plan/Contributing to Overall Learning Environment/Colleagiality
- 11 Showing Professionalism/Meeting Professional Obligations/Exercising Good Judgment
- 10 Infusing Technology into Lessons/Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
- 9 Providing Differentiated Instruction
- 8 Instructional Preparation and Planning/Designing Coherent Instruction
- 6 Using Standards-Based Instruction and Assessment

- 5 Engaging Students in Learning
- 5 Providing Feedback to Students/ Monitoring Student Performance
- 5 Child/Adolescent Development/Knowledge of Students
- 4 Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- 3 Accurate Recordkeeping
- 3 Attainment of Personal and Team Goals
- 3 Creating a Culture for Learning/Managing Instructional Environment
- 3 Advocacy for Students
- 2 Providing Real Life Connections for Students
- 2 Maintaining High Expectations/Continually Increasing Challenge as Students Meet Instructional Goals
- 1 Reflecting on Teaching/One's Performance
- 1 Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
- 1 Creating Interdisciplinary Opportunities
- 1 Developing and Implementing Literacy in all Subjects
- 1 Providing Supports for Students
- 1 Evidence Students Are Aware of Goals and Objectives
- 1 Gender Equity
- 1 Resource Application/Utilization
- 1 Developing/Maintaining Instructional Groups
- 1 Data Use and Analysis
- 1 Motivation
- 1 Knowledge of Special Education, 504/EST Protocols and Federal/State Law and Mandates

**9 As part of their evaluation, are teachers assigned a summative rating (e.g. Outstanding, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, etc.), a numerical rating, or an overall descriptor (e.g. Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, etc.)?**

<b>Answer Option</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
No	59.7%	184
Yes	40.3%	124

**12 If you answered "YES" to Question #9 regarding teacher evaluation levels, indicate the number of teachers at each rating level, from highest to lowest, according to their most recent evaluation. All five (5) fields require an entry. If your system uses fewer than five levels, enter NA in the unused field(s). (This information is required from each school by the**

**Stabilization Grant.) (THIS INFORMATION CANNOT BE PUBLISHED BECAUSE IT MAY IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS.)**

- 13 If you answered "YES" to Question #9 regarding teacher evaluation levels, indicate the percentage of teachers at each rating level, from highest to lowest, according to their most recent evaluation. All five (5) fields require an entry. If your system uses fewer than five levels, enter NA in the unused field(s). (This information is required from each school by the Stabilization Grant.) (THIS INFORMATION CANNOT BE PUBLISHED BECAUSE IT MAY IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS.)**

- 12 If you answered "No" to Question #9 regarding teacher evaluation levels, select all that apply and explain how the evaluation summarizes the process and informs the teacher regarding his/her overall performance.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
Separate Ratings across Multiple Domains	42.5%	79
Descriptive Narrative	83.9%	156
Narrative Summary of "360" Feedback (Feedback provided by multiple collaborators)	4.3%	8
Other	8.6%	16

**\*See appendix for text of written responses to question 12.**

- 13 Does your evaluation process include student assessment results, including student growth measures, as a criterion in determining teacher performance?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
No	82.5%	254
Yes	17.5%	54

- 14 If you answered that student assessment and growth data are used as part of teacher evaluations, indicate how significantly they are weighted? Please select the range which best approximates the weighting.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>10% or Less</b>	<b>10-30%</b>	<b>30-50%</b>	<b>More Than 50%</b>	<b>Not Weighted</b>
Approximate Weight	9	19	5	5	17

- 15 Are the aggregate results from all teacher evaluations used to plan for any of the following: Select all that apply.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
LEA-wide Professional Development	44.5%	137

School-wide Professional Development	89.0%	274
Equitable Distribution of Highly Rated Staff Across the LEA	2.3%	7
Equitable Distribution of Highly Rated Staff Across Sub-group Populations within the School	6.8%	21
Equitable Distribution of Highly Rated Staff Across Sub-group Populations across the LEA	1.6%	5
Teaching Assignments Matched to Instructional Performance in Specific Content Areas	21.8%	67

**16 Is the performance evaluation for an individual teacher used to determine or establish any of the following: Select all that apply.**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
Compensation	0.0%	0
Merit Pay	0.3%	1
Promotion	3.6%	11
Retention	41.0%	126
Individual Professional Development Plan Goals	79.2%	243
Job Assignment (within the school or elsewhere in the LEA)	22.1%	68
Required Improvement Plan	88.3%	271
Probation	67.8%	208
Dismissal	77.9%	239

**Is there overlap between schools that chose Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Merit Pay?**

94 schools chose Retention, Probation and Dismissal  
 104 schools chose Probation and Dismissal  
 18 schools chose Retention and Dismissal  
 4 schools chose Retention and Probation

**17 Do you currently report the number and/or the percentage of teachers at each performance level in a manner accessible to the public?**

Answer Options	Percent	Count
No	96.4%	297
Yes	3.6%	11

**18 If you answered YES to Question #17 regarding public reporting of evaluation data, please indicate which of the following methods you use to publicly report information on teacher evaluation results?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Count</b>
On Your Web Site	18.2%	2
In Your School Report	81.8%	9
In A Parent Notice	36.4%	4
In Your Newsletter	36.4%	4
At A Parent Night Meeting	18.2%	2
At A School Board Meeting	54.5%	6
At A PTA Meeting	0.0%	0
Other	9.1%	1

**Other Venues Indicated:**

2 HQT Status Report/District-wide report on qualifications of instructional staff

**19 What are your thoughts on the usefulness of a consistent statewide teacher evaluation process?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Excellent Idea</b>	<b>Good Idea</b>	<b>Might Be Useful</b>	<b>Not Needed</b>	<b>Terrible Idea</b>
Consistent Process	46	39	140	53	22

**20 Is there anything else you wish us to know about your evaluation system? (e.g. outcomes/impact data, longevity of your current process, history of the development and adoption of your process, etc.)**

**21 Thank you very much for your time. We appreciate the effort required to complete this survey. After we compile the statewide results, we will share them with you. If you have any additional comments or questions, please add them in the box below.**

**\*See appendix for text responses to questions 20 and 21**



## **Text Responses to Teacher Evaluation Survey**

### **Text Responses to Questions 3 and 4 (Is your teacher evaluation process determined by school board policy or by your master – i.e., contractual – agreement?)**

We are guided by Executive Limitations Policies (EL) Policy Title: Personnel Evaluations EL.05 With respect to evaluation of employees, the Superintendent shall not cause or allow an evaluation system that does not measure employee performance in terms of achieving the Board's Ends policies and complying with the Board's Executive Limitations policies. Accordingly, the Superintendent shall not: 1. Fail to develop and administer an evaluation system that is designed to: a. Improve instruction, b. Measure professional growth, development, and performance, c. Document unsatisfactory performance as well as excellent performance, d. Link central office administrator performance with multiple measures of district performance, e. Link building administrator performance with multiple measures of school performance, f. Link teachers' performance with multiple measures of student performance, g. Assure that scheduled instructional time is used to students' maximum advantage; 2. Fail to implement supervisory procedures for evaluators that ensure an accurate and complete evaluation of each employee; 3. Fail to provide to the Board an annual report on the effectiveness of the evaluation system and its alignment with the Board's Ends policies.

Although X does not have a formal policy, the X SD follows practices consistent with other member districts of the X SU.

Both the Master Agreement and Board Policy require evaluation of teachers. Board Policy requires job descriptions for professional educators, setting of performance goals linked to the School's current Action Plan. The schools in our supervisory union have adopted a teacher evaluation plan based on Charlotte Danielson's "Framework for Teaching."

What is defined in the contract is a timeline, not the procedures for evaluation. For example, by contract we have to notify the teachers by October 15 of how they will be evaluated.

Defined by Superintendent of Schools.

Goal setting and follow-up meetings to determine process of goal attainment. Goals must reflect teachers IPDP and coordinate with the district's strategic plan.

### **Text Responses to Question 5 (What is the frequency of teacher evaluations in your school?)**

Number of evaluations depends on the cycle.

Complete Evaluation Rubric 2x a year with teacher and principal.

I checked every 3 years because no other box was correct; however it is really every 5 years in X for teachers in the ongoing cycle.

I checked the "Every 3 years" box above--because there isn't an "Every 4 years" option. For experienced and high performing teachers in X, the formal evaluation is conducted every 4 years.

Teachers with less than 3 years are evaluated each year. Experienced teachers are once every 5 years. Improvement plans vary; the number of evaluations would also vary.

A minimum of two formal observations and a summative report for all teachers in their first two years of teaching. Other teachers with more than two years experience are observed on a rotating basis. All teachers also participate in a peer observation program.

All new teachers are evaluated for first two years and then are in a three year cycle.

All teachers are required to be evaluated annually. What that evaluation looks like varies as do the number of observations, but the evaluation is supposed to be done on everyone each year.

Every teacher is formally evaluated at least once a year. If the teacher is new to the school, the teacher is evaluated at least twice a year. New teachers receive a summative evaluation every year for the first three years of employment at school; otherwise, veteran teachers receive a summative evaluation every three years.

Formally, once a year for all teachers, except those on probation who would be at least twice a year. Informally, I am in classrooms daily for interactions and informal observations. I meet with teachers to evaluate progress on their goals and to discuss classroom practice monthly or more often.

Goal setting relative to student performance & identifying data to be used as evidence of achieving goal. New teachers - at least three formal observations in each of first two years w/ pre & post conferences Teachers w/ two or more years of teaching move through three phases - 1) direct (two observations a year) and 2-3) indirect (may not be observed) but set goals and meet w/ supervisor relative to goals. At the end of three years, they return to the direct phase. All levels of supervision have forms mid-year and end-of-year to complete relative to goals and Danielson Rubric. Teachers not demonstrating competencies within a domain may be put on a Focused Assistance Plan, placed on probation, or recommended for non-renewal.

It should be noted that the district is in the process of changing the current model. A district committee is beginning trials based on the Danielson Model with administrators and teachers. This new model will, upon adoption, replace the local model that is a cycle plan with new teachers starting on cycle one with observations required three times over the course of two years. Once a teacher has demonstrated competency in 1) classroom teaching, 2) contributing member of the staff, 3) communicating with parents, 4)

performance of routine duties, and 5) teacher as a constant learner, the teacher moves to a professional development cycle plan mutually agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator.

All new staff are formally evaluated using the Danielson Model. Walk through observations and follow-up written reports are conducted multiple times each year on all professional staff members. Through the information gained from these observations, the need for "formal" evaluation is determined and initiated as well as improvement plans. All professional staff members write annual professional goals and submit mid and end of year reports assessing their progress toward achieving these goals.

All teachers are formatively assessed each year by department chairs and members of the administration. Areas of focus are in pedagogy, assessment of and for learning. Summative assessments are done for the first 2 years for any new hires and on a three-year rotating schedule for all others. The summative focuses on 4 components of professional practices: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, & Professional Responsibility.

All teachers set professional goals for the year that are reviewed with administration. New teachers regardless of years of experience are evaluated twice per year for the first two years. Veteran teachers are evaluated once a year or provide a goal centered practice for the year. All teachers do a midyear and end of year review. Evaluations have a pre and post conference.

At the start of the year each teacher, in consultation with the principal, establish professional development goals for the year. The intent is to establish goals that will a) meet school goals (e.g. for the last three years there have been goals for all teachers related to DI/UbD) b) improve teacher performance in instruction and student support (based on teacher's perception of what they need to do to improve) and c) improve teacher performance in instruction and student support (based on principal's perception of what the teacher needs to do to improve. The teacher meets with the principal every 4-6 weeks to review progress on these goals. If necessary, the principal will do an in class observation related to the goals. The principal will also do drop-by visits to classes and, when appropriate add comments at the next meeting. In March each teacher prepares a self-evaluation regarding their progress on each goal. The principal also prepares an observation on the perceived progress on the goals. Each teacher meets with the principal to discuss their perceptions on progress toward the goals as well as other items such as student surveys (all teachers are required to gather input on their teaching and classes from all students) and work on non-goals such as advisories. The principal completes an annual review that is signed by the teacher (who may add comments if they choose). The review includes projected goals for the following year. If a teacher has not made appropriate progress on goals, a follow-up assessment and report is scheduled for late spring. IF A TEACHER IS CONSIDERED DEFICIENT IN ANY AREA, they will be put on a corrective action plan. This plan is a more direct model of the teacher evaluation with the understanding that, if a teacher does not fully meet required goals they will be terminated from the school. Goals on these plans are established by the administration and are directly related to deficiencies that have an observed negative impact on students.

A teacher under a corrective action plan meets at least every two weeks to review their work and progress related to the goals. As necessary the principal observes the teacher in class and provides direct feedback to the teacher on their level of improvement. As needed and within reason the school provides the teacher with support in gaining knowledge and/or skills necessary to meet these goals. IF A TEACHER IS A FIRST YEAR TEACHER, in addition to the general evaluation plan, the principal conducts a minimum of two formal observations/evaluations of the teacher prior to the end of the first semester. Following each observation the principal writes an observation/evaluation report and reviews it with the teacher. Generally these reports include perceived strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for improvement. If deemed necessary these could also become formal goals.

X District revised the Danielson model with help of a committee made up of teachers and administrators. For all new teachers they are in an intensive cycle for the first two or three years. After that they are considered ongoing and evaluated every 5th year. In between all teachers are required to have goals, meet with the Principal in October to discuss the goals and in June to report on their progress.

Danielson Framework and rubric are the models for evaluative instruments. Beginning teachers and those new to the SU are evaluated with multiple measures in mind twice/annually for the first two years. Third-year teachers have one annual cycle. Experienced/Proficient teachers every other year. Those on improvement plans have a prescribed action plan to follow.

We use Danielson's "Framework" for the criteria, local process involving: Annual Professional Growth Plans for all teachers every year; pre-observation, observation, post-observation, report annually for new teachers, every other year for veteran teachers. Annual Summative Evaluation for year in which teacher is observed.

Developed by committee of teachers, administrators and community members 8 years ago, the process includes annual professional goals with reflection on the previous year's goals, observations of all teachers with pre and post meetings, and a three year evaluation cycle. New teachers are evaluated twice annually for their first two years of employment. The three year summative evaluation uses a standards-based rubric, and teachers maintain a portfolio to provide evidence of proficiency.

Due to the high number of staff members, I have a 4 year evaluation cycle. Newly hired teachers are observed formally twice a year and a full written evaluation is submitted at the end of the year. Experienced teachers are observed formally and informally, numerous times a year and a formal summary of the evaluation is submitted at the end of the year, every three years.

Goal setting based on IPDP and district Strategic Plan, including conferencing, observations and written evaluation. The number of evaluations is determined by the teacher's seniority and the evaluation cycle, i.e. summative or formative.

I formally observe each new teacher once a year for two years and I do two informal drop-ins as well. At the end of two years, if the teacher has successfully been evaluated, he/she is placed on a three year cycle. For the tenured teachers, one formal observation is required by contract and two drop-in visits.

New hires - 3 formative observations and 1 summative evaluation; veteran teachers - 2 formative observations and 1 summative evaluation. Areas addressed in narrative form - Planning, Facilitation of Learning, Assessment, and Environment.

Our district uses the model provided by Research for Better Teaching, based in Massachusetts. New teachers are to be evaluated for their first two years in the district. After that, teachers are typically on a 3 year cycle of evaluation, two years of supervision, back to evaluation. This can be amended if the evaluator has concerns with the teacher's performance. We base our observations and evaluation on adopted performance standards for teachers.

Summative evaluation in years one and four of seven year licensure. One to two formal observations in this cycle. Formative evaluation in other years with goal setting.

Teachers are notified by October 1st of every year as to whether they will be in an evaluation or supervision model. Standard practice has veteran teachers in the evaluation cycle every three years. During the two years when they are not being formally evaluated they are in the supervision cycle of the process, which requires goal setting and documentation from the individual teacher.

Teachers, in collaboration, select annual goals related to school's Action Plan and meet with peers and/or administrators to gain new learning and meet goals. They meet with principal to review goals at beginning and end of the school year. Formal observations and evaluations are conducted every three years. New teachers have mentor/coaches and are formally evaluated at least twice in their first two years in the district.

The Blue Ribbon Document is used for teacher evaluation. This places teachers on a 7-year cycle. New teachers are on a summative evaluation for two years and then go on the 7-year cycle. The 7-year cycle looks like this: Year 1,2,4,5 are peer review or goal setting; Year 3, 6 are summative; Year 7 is recertification.

The SU has a Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Plan with a defined purpose and philosophy that is based on Danielson's work. It includes Danielson's rubric, modified, as well as a Supervision and Evaluation cycle that corresponds to the State's licensing cycle and our local standards board. Probationary teachers are in a summative cycle (clearly defined by month and expectations of teacher and supervisor) for 2 years and then a Formative Cycle for their 3rd year. Continuing teachers = year 1 – summative; years 2&3 – formative; year 4- summative; years 5&6 – formative; and year 7 is a documentation year. Both the summative and formative years are clearly defined and forms are included for documentation purposes. The plan also has an improvement plan component.

The system was adopted by all schools in the X Supervisory Union. New teachers must have 3 cycles of pre-conference, observation, and post conference before completing the Danielson summative rubric. There is a cover sheet to the rubric which is very clear about how the teacher is rated in each of the 4 domains and whether or not the summative indicates the overall performance is "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". There are then three choices indicating the cycle for the following year: summative, formative, or focused assistance plan. Any teacher with an unsatisfactory rating goes into focused assistance. For veterans who are in the 3 year summative part of the cycle, there has to be at least one pre conference, observation, and post conference along with other evidence that is gathered in accordance with the Master Agreement. In the formative cycle, teachers set goals consistent with their IPDP and the school's Action Plan, and must submit evidence at the end of the year.

We have a local model that is based on the criteria of both Danielson and Research for Better Teaching. We use "Walk-Throughs" daily to determine how teachers are doing and who might need a more formal evaluation rather than depend on an "every two year" rule. New teachers and teachers new to an assignment or on a plan of assistance are formally evaluated (in addition to regular "walk-throughs" ) at least twice a year.

We have a three year cycle for experienced teachers using the Danielson model.

We have locally adapted Danielson's "Framework for Teaching." The administrative evaluation cycle for new teachers includes the following steps 1) Goal setting 2) Two announced observations where there are pre and post conferences and reports 3) one unannounced observation with a post conference and report and a 4) summative report. Teachers on an improvement cycle will have a greater number of observations. Experienced and successful teachers will cycle through the self-reflective and collaborative team evaluation models before returning to the administrative evaluation cycle.

We use all components of the Danielson Rubric. New teachers and teachers up for license renewal have three observations in one year. I rotate through all the other teachers. Last year, 90% of the faculty were observed and evaluated as I was a new principal.

We use Charlotte Danielson's model. I believe it is a national model adapted, but it may be just the commercial model. We have adapted it to a 7 year cycle. Every new teacher has a summative assessment for his/her first 2 years employed at our school. All other teachers – Year 1, Year 4 Summative, Year 2,3,5,6 Formative, Year 7 = IPDP goals and re-licensure. The year on the cycle that a teacher is placed is based on the teacher's particular license and renewal dates.

We use Danielson's "Framework for Teaching" model. We have adapted this at the local level. We require teachers who are not in the formal evaluation cycle to complete a self-directed professional goal plan. This plan may be a 1 year, 2 year, or 3 year plan, and can be either an individualized goal plan or a special project with a colleague.

We use Danielson's framework based on a 7 year cycle.

We use Danielson's framework to evaluate teacher performance at least once every seven years or more often if on probation. The evaluation consists of at least two formal observations during the evaluation year.

We use Danielson's Framework adapted locally - it is differentiated to meet needs of teachers: more administrator/teacher time in first 2 years based on professional development and goal setting every 4 years.

We use the Danielson Framework for Teaching, but modify the timetable for evaluations.

We use the Danielson model. All teachers are in a 7 year cycle with summative years 1 and 4 and goal setting years 2,3,5,6 and 7. All teachers are evaluated in this system every year.

We utilize the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching model. All educators are formally evaluated 2 times in a 7 year period and informally evaluated on the other years. New hires have formal evaluations during the first two years of employment. New hires to the district are paired with mentor teachers in the district. All teachers must write professional goals aligned with our school action plans and initiatives every year.

Teachers are evaluated on Planning, Facilitation of learning, Assessment, and Environment. Each domain has specific areas to be evaluated. Each teacher is evaluated 2 or 3 times/per year of their 3 year cycle. Each teacher receives a summative evaluation at the end of their evaluation cycle. We have looked at and piloted Danielson's Framework. We are working as a district to change/enhance our teacher evaluation system. It is part of the teacher's negotiated contract so administrators cannot change the evaluation system without Union on board and part of the process.

Three tier system: Level I is a direct, minimum 2 (3 for new teachers) observation/post conference, Level II: IPDP-style goal setting, Level III: same as Level II.

It is based on a 7 year cycle to match the re-licensing process which I think is an excellent idea. During the 7 year cycle, there are 3 different types of evaluation. Summative (observations and an evaluation) (years 1 and 4), Formative (goals and a final summary) (years 2,3,5,6), Re-licensing (share plan and administrator writes a reflection) (year 7).

X school evaluation is on a 3 year cycle. Teachers on off cycle of administrator's observation still receive a summative evaluation based on teacher's professional yearly goals, peer coaching and special projects.

My data could be misleading. We only complete a summative evaluation each year for about 25% of our teachers- depending on where they are on the 7 year cycle. So my percentages are based only on the teachers whom we evaluated summatively last year – a

total of 20 teachers. Since we have used the Charlotte Danielson model (4 years), we have had much more consistent S&E in our district, and much more feedback, and we have actually observed, and some teachers have decided to chose alternative career paths based on the evaluation.

Question #5 did not have an answer that adequately described how often we evaluate veteran teachers (everyone except new teachers). Teachers are on a five-year cycle; for four of the five years they participate in a personal plan (an independent self-reflection or peer collaboration) that is approved by an administrator. Once during the five years, an administrator does a series of observations and meetings with the teacher as part of a formal evaluation. None of the possible answers described this, and since I had to give an answer, that answer is not correct.

### **Text Responses to Question 7 (What teacher evaluation model do you use?)**

**[Text answers were only included if they provided additional information beyond the name(s) of the model(s) used. Identical text responses were only included once.]**

A formal process called Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Protocol is in place for all tenured teachers. It involves the development of a formal "written plan" that addresses one to four of the Danielson Frameworks. The teacher identifies a peer teacher and gathers resources to assist in the completion of the protocol. Classroom observations and supervisor/teacher conferences are part of the plan. The teacher finally completes a self-assessment and reflection and the supervisor completes a formal written review to conclude the process.

All new staff are formally evaluated using the Danielson Model. Walk through observations and follow-up written reports are conducted multiple times each year on all professional staff members. Through the information gained from these observations, the need for "formal" evaluation is determined and initiated as well as improvement plans. All professional staff members write annual professional goals and submit mid and end of year reports assessing their progress toward achieving these goals.

Being my first year in the school, I will be combining the Danielson model with the William Rebus model. I will also be using daily walk-throughs as part of the evaluation.

Based on the work of Charlotte Danielson. Includes goal setting and a district lesson plan format. Instrument provides documentation (evidence and rating) of the following: a) lesson planning and preparation b) learning environment (classroom management) c) instruction d) professional responsibilities.

Blue Ribbon Document is a tool with rubrics for the 5 standards for VT educators. The process is intended to promote the developmental growth of all members of the school community. It consists of peer collaboration and self reflection, summative evaluation, and a re-licensure process component.



Danielson's Framework is the basis for a supervision and evaluation process that includes goal setting, walkthroughs, formal observation (announced and unannounced), and reflective practices.

X Supervisory Union Supervision and Evaluation Model – Every teacher on an annual basis will participate in a supervision and evaluation component. A four-year flow chart places teachers at different component points. This includes: Component A Focused Assistance / Adapting to new concepts; Component B Focused Assistance / Improving current practice; Component C Administrative Consultation; Component D Colleague Consultation; Component E Self Directed Focus. Upon successful completion, teachers may move to another component for the next school year.

Experienced teachers develop a professional growth plan (PGP) for a three year cycle. New teachers develop a PGP for their first year. Teachers in need of improvement develop a plan for improvement collaboratively with the administration. This model involves peer coaching. All PGP and improvement models include a written self-assessment by the teacher and may involve an observation by the principal.

For instructional purposes: pre-conference, setting measurable objectives, observations, post-conference. Overall: Summative evaluation: based on knowledge, pedagogy, student relationships, discipline, professionalism, parent involvement.

I believe in situational supervision/evaluation. We use a combination of Danielson's domains and Three Minute Walk Throughs to gain information. Final evaluation incorporates this data with evidence of having met yearly goals and criteria set by the admin. (i.e., this year, evidence of tech integration, differentiation, and implementation of Developmental Design practices.) We use the Danielson domains. We also use the SAMPI and a version of the SAMPI that I developed for special educators. For some we use the master, professional, apprentice, etc. system. For others, we use a scale of 1-5. If a teacher is on an improvement plan, we use either the NAESP rating scale and categories, or Danielson's.

I complete an hour long running record to be analyzed in narrative form and corresponding to a Danielson rubric that has been turned into list format with a 5 point scale and comments. Pre and Post Observation meetings are held as well. Teachers submit relevant materials to me ahead of the formal observation and evaluation. On a regular basis I employ a walk-through model to continually assess the entire school for standards of practice.

In addition to formal classroom observations and Walkthroughs, teachers are evaluated in the areas of Planning and Preparation, Professional Responsibilities, Classroom Environment and Instruction using a 4 point scale. There is also a self-evaluation component.

It includes both a rubric adapted from Danielson along with yearly goals that must be related to the school's action plan and must include evidence of student achievement.

It is a model that combines the professional relicensing standards with Danielson's work. Danielson rubrics have been used in conjunction with each of the standards.

It is a standards-based tool based upon the learning opportunities found in the Vermont Framework of Standards. It is in rubric form and assesses 14 different characteristics. It was originally developed by VISMT, the VT DOE, and teachers from the X Elementary School.

It is based largely on the South Carolina system-System of Continuous Improvement for Professional Educators.

It's an adapted version of Danielson. Her model is so very thorough with the collection by teachers of a lot of evidence and many more coaching meetings.

John Saphir, Tomlinson & Hackett. I use a pre-conference and post with a narrative approach with walk-throughs/observations using a checklist/narrative focusing on "teacher effectiveness" research (teacher behaviors related to student achievement, 1981).

Meaningful Faculty Evaluation: Faculty Development and Renewal (TM) by ISM is fundamentally a career-long conversation between individual teachers and their individual administrators about the higher-order professional/technical understandings and behaviors that collectively become "difference-makers" for students.

Narrative which comprises the lesson framework of "to- with - and by" - purposeful planning model from NYC -District #2.

Observation form addresses planning, implementation, assessment, and environment.

Teachers are notified in advance of formal observation times by the principal. All evaluations must be done by March 1st. Teachers may submit lesson plans in advance. There is a post observation conference prior to the write up.

Our differentiated supervision and evaluation plan is based on Charlotte Danielson's "Framework for Teaching". It includes different expectations for different levels of teaching experience, and rubrics designed to meet the needs of a variety of professional roles.

Our evaluation process, as it currently stands, was decided upon by the X (Union) and the former administrators and School Board. We are currently in the process of passing a format relating to Danielson. However, we are getting quite a lot of friction from the union, as they state they will not pass the Danielson Model. We have three parts to the current model; Appendix A (the goal statements); Appendix B (the formal process of observation and evaluation); and Appendix C (the formal write-up signed by both parties).

Our teacher evaluation model has been recently redesigned based upon the Danielson "Framework for Teaching". It was adapted to reflect local needs and included teachers, administrators, and school board in the development process.

Outdated and subjective.

Pre-conference (meeting with teacher to arrange a lesson observation, noting data and information they request). Observation (observed by principal, notes compiled for post-conference with teacher). Post-conference (observation notes shared, conference input included, recommendations and insights shared, notes revised for final observation document).

Pre-conferences are scheduled and held. Observations are scheduled and then they occur. Administrators review observations during post conferences, adjust them as necessary, and then write them up.

Pre-observation conference. Formal observation. Post- observation conference. Formal written evaluation placed on file and submitted to superintendent.

Pre-observation; Observation; Self-Assessment; Debriefing Meeting.

Sample of grid used at this school along with written dialogue: Teacher Evaluation Proficiency Scale: U=unsatisfactory, M=Minimum, NP=Nearly Proficient, P=Proficient, DN=Did Not Evaluate Evidence Type: A=Artifact, C=Conference, o=Observation, P=Portfolio, M=Meeting.

The manual that is written is based on Danielson's work, but it is hard to read and follow. I have only been here for 4 years, so I am unaware who created the model. One thing I do know is that the principals in the X SU hate it and do not use it except for me and X elementary school.

Skillful Teacher framework of teaching is used as the basis of evaluation. Components assessed vary with the experience level of the teacher and/or their specific professional needs.

System of Continuous Improvement for Professional Educators (SCIPLE) is a differentiated approach to the evaluation of professional performance as it relates to the responsibilities associated with excellent professional practice as outlined by the eight major function areas of teaching. This model is intended to promote risk-taking, collaboration, inquiry, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Teachers are evaluated on four domains (planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities) using Danielson: A Framework for Teaching as a model. The process includes, goal setting, pre and post observation conferences based on a formal observation and informal observations which

involve a requirement for teacher reflection. The number of formal observations required depends on the quadrant in which a teacher falls.

Teachers are placed on one of four tracks in the supervision and evaluation cycle. New teachers are on the administrative/consultation cycle for their first two years. Non probationary teachers are assigned a track each year by October 1. There are performance competencies by which teachers are evaluated that are grounded in a body of research that identifies the most effective principles of instruction. There are 22 competencies. All faculty are responsible for demonstrating a satisfactory level of performance in each competency. We use a rubric in the evaluation/supervision process to define skill levels, inform teachers of expectations and create opportunity for teachers to reflect on practice as they develop goals and or improvement plans.

Teachers have a professional growth plan that proscribes steps dependent upon their year in the licensing cycle.

Teachers pose two learning questions, and the principal collects data according to those two questions. There are pre and post conferences held. In addition, teachers set goals, and progress toward their goals is part of the discussion.

Teachers receive two formative evaluations and one summative. The formative is based on classroom observations and the summative includes the formatives and any ways the teacher contributes to the school and district.

Teachers set goals at the beginning of the year and meet to discuss these with me at which time I may suggest an addition or modification. During formative years the teacher meets with me again at the end of the year to discuss his/her progress during the year. During summative years the teacher is observed twice with a pre and post conference. A formal evaluation is written at the end of the year.

Teachers will be formally evaluated at reasonable intervals throughout the school year. Primary method is observations. Local Rubric is used that looks at Subject Knowledge, Variety of Teaching Methods, Classroom Climate, Curriculum Development, Assessment, Advocacy, Collegiality, Professional Growth, Resources, Civic and Social Responsibility, Classroom Management, and Ability to Connect with Students. Each of these domains has a rubric that breaks out specific skills to demonstrate the teacher's competence in meeting them.

The Danielson Model with Skillful Teacher overlay based upon the teacher's professional growth plan which is written every three years.

The district's evaluation procedures were developed collaboratively between the union and administration in 1994. They were revised in 1999, and are currently undergoing a second revision. There is a set of "Performance Criteria for Educational Professionals", but there is not rubric by which teacher performance can be measured against these criteria.

The evaluation process is based on X SU Professional Standards and RBT, Research for Better Teaching. Teachers are placed on the evaluation cycle every three years. On "off years," they're on the supervision cycle. The evaluation process includes a pre-observation, a post-observation conference and a written report. All teachers, including those on the supervision cycle, set annual goals. Teacher on the supervision cycle submit a written reflection on their goals at the end of the year. Teachers on the evaluation cycle receive a summative report at the end of the school year.

The focus of evaluation is based on the overall goals we have established, which are based on research on how children learn. Current areas of focus include: Curriculum is based on engaging content that is linked to essential content; Technology is used to engage learner, assist them in asking questions and seeking knowledge, and as a tool of creative production; Formative and ongoing assessment are used to guide instruction; and Instructional practices are engineered to maximize all students' access to learning.

The model is based on Danielson's rubrics for enhancing teacher performance. Each teacher sets annual goals based on the rubric. Each year, 50% of faculty self assess with evidence on those goals. 50% do the same plus do a summative cycle involving observation and a written summative report. An improvement plan may come during either of the phases.

The model we are moving to as a district is using Marzano's work on the art & science of teaching. We will be trained this winter in using this system electronically.

The X Public Schools evaluation model is based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and selected categories and indicators of effective teaching. All teachers new to the district must go through two years of a comprehensive evaluation process with at least two formal teaching observations, along with a mid-year and comprehensive evaluation at the end of each year. After that, teachers are on a three year cycle with comprehensive evaluation in the first year. The second year is dedicated to professional development where the teacher and administrator establish goals that the teacher will fulfill during the year. The third year is focused on growth and dedicated to one specific category or indicator of effective teaching. This, again, is created with the supporting administrator.

The system includes a number of components: teacher yearly action plan and reflections, formative supervision based on formal observations by the principal, a teacher portfolio, and a summative evaluation which takes into account professional development, collegiality, advocacy for students, in addition to teaching practice.

The Union and the school district have drafted a model that is used in this district.

This is my first year in X so I'm unsure of the history of the evaluation model used. I think it's local. Teachers are evaluated on their Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. I use a proficiency scale and

need to document evidence of proficiency (artifact, conference, observation, portfolio or self-assessment). There are pre and post conferences with the teacher.

This model is based on goal setting, which aligns with the school's action plan and the district's strategic plan/action steps. All staff are formally observed annually and depending on their steps in the 7 year certification process, summative evaluations are written. Teachers self-assess on a rubric as they write their goals.

Variety of Tools as Required by Circumstances or Agreement: Level One: New Teacher/Teacher New to the District-Saphier Model/Contractual Protocols Level Two: Experienced Teacher in Good Standing- Collaborative Model/Local Model Level Three: Teacher in Need of Supervision-Saphier Model/Contractual Protocols Level Four: Notification of Non-Renewal- Saphier Model/Contractual Protocols/Local Model.

We are currently working with a modified version of Danielson's Framework. We have a three year cycle - cycle one is an observation cycle (three observations with a summative)- can be a two year cycle, while Cycles two and three are project learning years - with a summative evaluation. We use a modified Danielson rubric to identify specific areas of work for each professional.

We are in the process of relooking at our S&E model. Currently it is a very traditional model that includes pre-observation, observation and post observation conferences. A summative report is written to compile all of the observations and conversations.

We are working closely from the Danielson model, but are currently in the process of fine-tuning/creating greater uniformity regarding the steps of implementation.

We conduct multiple walk-throughs for every teacher. New teachers and those for whom we note concerns receive formal evaluations using the Danielson Framework.

We currently use a rubric that outlines the evaluation process, observations and a summative at the end of the year.

We have adopted the Danielson model as our blueprint; and have modified it to fit our specific needs and goals. I am on a committee that has been working on this for a year. We are piloting it this year.

We have five categories a teacher can fall into: Goal Setting, Intensive, Ongoing, Colleague Consultation and Focused Assistance. Each category has its own type of observation and reflection system. The categories are based on the Danielson's Framework for Teaching with checklists supporting four key areas of teacher performance as are outlined in that model.

We have identified Professional Performance Standards for Teachers district-wide, and I use my training in The Skillful Teacher and Observing and Analyzing Teachers, both from Research for Better Teaching (RBT) to guide and shape my observations and

written reports. I also use the BRIM framework of “rigor, relevance and relationships” as well as Bloom's Taxonomy to guide my work with teachers. In addition, our school has developed a working definition of Rigor and this document has been merged with the Professional Performance Standards to form the basis of our classroom observations.

We rate teacher performance using Yes, No, or NA scale for items related to the domains of Planning, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities.

We use a differentiated model in which all professionals participate in the process through one of five components. Goals are identified as part of the annual process and are related to the school's annual action plan as well as the teacher's IPDP. Our evaluation process recognizes the differentiated strengths and needs of staff members. The ultimate goal of the process is to enhance student learning.

We use a model that is based on the Danielson framework, but extends to areas that are not specifically addressed in the Danielson model.

We use a model that was adapted from a model provided from the University of North Carolina that focuses on 8 major competency areas. We have different evaluation strands that are contingent on the teacher's needs and experience.

We use a variant of Danielson. It requires the observer to rate 4 domains: --instruction --class management --pro. development --planning and preparation.

We use Danielson's model--with some local adaptations (e.g., locally developed rubrics for specific positions such as library/media specialist; special educators; guidance; nurse).

We use the Danielson Model but have made modifications to include additional teaching standards.

We used Danielson's "Framework for Teaching" as a model for the evaluation instrument and have developed a process for goal setting and lesson planning.

We utilize the Danielson Framework. In addition to the traditional observations and evaluations done by the Principal, we also have implemented a comprehensive system of peer coaching for all staff and mentoring for new staff. The entire district has been and continues to be systematically trained in these areas.

When teachers are observed I look for the "components of professional practice" outlined in Carl Glickman's book, "Leadership for Learning". Teachers are expected to be responsible for these aspects of teaching, as reflecting the district's focus on differentiated instruction. Standard aspects of professionalism are also included in the evaluation.

X has a dynamic and well designed system based on the Danielson model. We also stress annual "self-evaluation" and "annual goals" designed by the teacher. Peer collaboration is

encouraged. Individual teacher professional development is based on their own goals in a self-designed Professional Growth Plan (with administrator feedback and approval).

X School recently adopted a new evaluation process last year. The process includes goals, pre and post conferences in addition to classroom observations. The process provides for open communication with teachers: student assessments, student work, goals, walk-throughs, etc....each teacher is placed on a two year cycle (formative and summative) and each teacher submits annual goals.

Our evaluation system is based on work by Charlotte Danielson. It was developed within the past five years. Our administrative team developed the evaluation system, in consultation with the faculty of our supervisory union. The administrative team included the Superintendent, Curriculum Director, Special Education Director, and principals.

Our evaluation system was created by a team of administrators, teachers, and board members and is based on the latest research on best practices. It is a working document.

Our plan was designed and developed through a committee of administrators and teachers K-12 working over several years. It is revised/updated as needed.

Our process is new - this is its 2nd year. It was developed by a committee with the Superintendent and shared with staff for feedback purposes prior to implementation. The process is thorough if implemented as developed.

Our process was created with administrators and teachers. It is updated and revised every few years. Teachers and administrators seem comfortable with the system.

Our process was developed this summer and is in the first year of implementation.

Our program is based in one developed through Research for Better Teaching and The Skillful Teacher program.

Our staff was trained in the Danielson Framework. They are used to it and understand that they are evaluated based on the four domains.

Our system has only been place in total for about three years. It was phased in over the previous two. Being drawn up over a couple of years prior to that by a joint faculty/administration committee was beneficial in all parties taking ownership. By paralleling its benchmarks with the 7-year licensure time frame, it helps teachers keep in touch with their long-range goals yearly. It clearly has provisions allowing for professional growth as well as self-assessment and student input.

Our system is a tiered system, with teachers given the opportunity to set their goals and move in a specific direction (with support and guidance from the administration). **(same answer provided by 2 principals).**



Our system is research based and recently revised to include a focus on formative assessment as a requirement in a formal observation, as well as action planning as part of goal-setting.

The document was developed by a committee that included administrators, teachers and district staff members. It was discussed with union representatives and was approved at the board level. The use of the rubric allows what could be a very subjective process to be much more objective.

The evaluation process was developed 6 years ago by a wide ranging committee of teachers and administrators. It values professional development and input from a variety of sources in the 7 year cycle of teacher licensure.

The model that we have in place now has been in use for the past six years. It was developed collaboratively between the professional staff and the administration over an 18 month period with a pilot phase for making changes and modifications. The model has been approved both by the school board and the Education Association and it emphasizes a process of continual growth and development. The connection between our supervision and evaluation model and individual professional development plans represents a close alignment. Furthermore, the professional staff and administration collaborate closely on the selection of professional development to meet all professional needs as instructional requirements and demands change.

The system is based on the RBT (Research for Better Teaching) and our XSU teacher performance standards. I find it very valuable to gaining a better understanding of my staff, and their talents and needs.

We have a hybrid system using Danielson's Framework and an outdated local process. A committee of teachers, administrators and board members collaborated on the development of the evaluative criteria that were approved by the associations and the board three years ago as required by the master agreement. When the committee continued its work and then tried to develop a complementary process subsequent to the adoption of the Evaluative Criteria (Danielson's Framework), local political issues arose and the associations overwhelmingly defeated that proposal, even though it would have significantly supported the professional development of teachers.

**Text Responses to Question 12 (How does your evaluation process inform the teacher regarding his/her overall performance?)**

A formal evaluation write-up summarizes a teacher's performance in most of the areas described above.

A narrative summary followed by a meeting with the teacher to discuss their evaluation.

Categories of "Commendations" and "Recommendations" are the two breakdowns used.

Danielson Framework - each domain area is rated and a narrative summary is included in the final evaluation

Descriptive narrative includes how teacher performs relative to the criteria and addresses recommendations for improvement.

A detailed narrative addresses the teachers' effectiveness in the classroom, their role in the school and their work meeting their individual goals.

Each domain has components which are evaluated. Evidence is gathered and feedback is provided. Aside from the separate ratings, self reflections are written by the teachers and a summative narrative is written by the evaluator.

Evaluation process provides a rating of criteria in each domain [planning and preparation, learning environment (classroom management), instruction and professional responsibilities]. A short comment is also included as a summary of the lesson and/or additional suggestions. Each observation includes a pre and post visit conference.

Feedback from peers or other coaches.

Feedback from various collaborators that include students, teacher leaders, administrators.

For formal classroom observations, the supervising administrator rates the observation in three of the Danielson domains. Each spring teachers receive a summative report that combines these observations with walk-through observations and the teachers' achievement of their professional goals. The summative evaluation is a description narrative based on these three areas.

I do a summative narrative citing strengths and areas for growth. Additionally, I rate the teacher on all components across the four domains: Planning and Preparation; Classroom Environment; Instruction; and Professional Responsibility.

There is a descriptive narrative written by the principal of every teacher each year. These include the perceived progress of the teacher on each of the professional development goals for that year. The manner in which they are assessed and reported depends on the goal. In virtually all cases a statement is included that identifies the perceived level of achievement (exceeded the goal, met the goal, made progress on the goal, made limited progress on the goal, made no progress on the goal). The rating is based on principal evaluation, elements of the teacher self-evaluation and, as appropriate, data collection, observations, student ratings, etc.

Narrative addresses success in meeting building/ supervisory union action steps and the six domains mentioned in the first box of this survey.

Planning and Preparation, Instruction, Environment, Professional Responsibilities. Under each are sub-questions that are answered. Yes, To Some Extent, or No. The teacher then also receives a narrative on a lesson based on the Principles of Learning.

Pre and post conferencing are also used. Also walk-throughs are performed and if there needs to be formative feed back, it is given verbally.

Pre observation conference, post observation conference, each criteria of each domain is rated and evidence is provided for each rating.

Separate Ratings across Multiple Domains, Descriptive Narrative, Narrative Summary of "360" Feedback (Feedback provided by multiple collaborators).

Several pieces of evidence collected throughout the year inform the overall assessment of a teacher's performance.

Summary of progress toward goals based on evidence.

Teachers are given "pre-evaluation" forms; there are several classroom visits over the course of a week or more; then they meet to review feedback and complete post-observation form and set goals for improvement.

Teachers select an area of improvement within the Danielson Framework of acceptable teaching practices. They then devise a plan, using peer support, to promote self-improvement. After consultation with an administrator, they proceed with their plan. Administrators do observations and summative consultations to determine how well the teacher succeeded.

The X School District modified the Danielson rubric and does not include a "distinguished" level. After observations, during post conferences, the teacher and the Principal complete the rubric as it applies to that observation. A narrative is written in June that summarizes all of the observations throughout the year and the performance across all domains of Danielson.

The descriptive narrative includes evidence collected during observations and then describes that evidence relative to Danielson's four domains.

The evaluative feedback gained through the rating across multiple domains, narrative evaluative feedback, teacher self reflection, and teacher -supervisor dialogue regarding the teacher's professional practice affirms quality professional practice and frames areas of improvement/growth that can be captured in the following year's professional goals plans.

The narrative format that I use addresses each category and sub-category of Danielson's domains. I gather the information over a year long process of using the 3 minute walkthrough method at least three times a week. In the 3 minute model, I note the level of

on task student behavior, the instructional mode of the teacher, and then identify which of Marzano's 9 most effective teaching strategies that I see being used at the time. After 10 visitations I provide teachers with the tabulated data, and then save the data for summative evaluations.

The process requires a number of teacher/supervisor conferences with feedback being given both verbally and in formal written narratives.

There are eight major function areas that allow for narrative summation without a formal demarcation of overall value.

Using the Danielson framework, each domain is rated and a narrative summary is done for the final evaluation.

We have not begun using the ratings yet. Next year would be the soonest that we will begin to implement the new ratings system.

We highlight the sections of the rubric that apply and further describe through a narrative. We use a descriptive narrative using Observing Analyzing Teaching as a template. This narrative describes a teacher's strengths and weaknesses in Curriculum Planning, Student Management and Motivation, Instructional Strategies, and Professional Responsibilities. As a result of the summative, we indicate whether a teacher is renewed for the next cycle or whether the teacher needs to move to intensive supervision the following year. The clear majority of teachers are renewed the following year.

We use descriptive narrative based using Observing, Analyzing Teaching as a template.

Having common descriptors of good teaching practice has helped improve instruction. We use a process in which the teacher and principal independently evaluate a lesson, meet to discuss disagreements and collaborate on any direction that the teacher will take that is indicated by the observation.

I like the teacher supervision and evaluation plan we use. As an administrator, I am able to see the planning and prep a teacher puts in to their professional plan for supervision and evaluation. Our teachers meet with me and after discussion, they pick a domain and elements from the Danielson model to focus on. They write up a plan and provide time in the classroom for me to observe them, ask questions, meet and then they complete a self reflection piece. I believe our process allows teachers to take risks in areas they may be weak in, explore new areas and grow professionally.

My evaluation process is only a part of ongoing dialog about teaching and learning. It recognizes the complexity and difficulty of the job of teaching, while holding teachers to consistent standards of practice. It is only one small part of my day to day year-long responsibility to consistently monitor and provide feedback to professional educators. The actual written report of a formal observation is not as important as what we do day in and day out.

**Text Responses to Question 19 (How do you feel about the usefulness of a consistent statewide teacher evaluation process?)**

Would be good tool to review for hiring new teachers - A greater consistency of what a good teacher is across various schools.

A collaborative effort will enhance the performance leading to enhanced performance and ultimately enhanced learning for students.

A common standard of quality teaching would be a powerful tool. It must be developed in complete collaboration with professional staff.

A common system would (hopefully) simplify the evaluation process. However, it seems important that a common tool would have room for additional elements deemed important in a particular school.

A consistent definition of the components of effective teacher practices would be useful. **(This exact response was provided by 2 principals.)**

Individual schools need to match processes to a wide range of school-specific factors from professional development needs to student performance data. **(This exact response was provided by 6 principals.)**

A consistent evaluation process would help administrators collaborate and discuss evaluation methods, which would increase our ability to perform the task.

A consistent state-wide evaluation process would improve professionalism, improve instruction, limit community perceptions of good vs. bad schools, support a statewide teacher contract for salary, improve movement between schools to increase broad-based experience.

A consistent, and uniform evaluation tool would do the following: a. Ease of data collection, b. State-Wide training opportunities for staff and administrators, c. Consistent use of evaluation tool across districts (people would be familiar with the process), and d. make available data for use on contracts, evaluation completion, monitoring.

A one-size fits all model will not be effective. Just like students, an individualized plan for evaluation of teachers would be beneficial.

A statewide evaluation process could be used to strengthen local evaluation procedures.

A statewide teacher evaluation may be helpful for employment practices but probably would not be all that useful in developing teachers' skills.

All too often people move from their positions to other districts that use different evaluation tools. If everyone used the same tool, training would just transfer over and statewide expectations would also be consistent.

Although having a consistent statewide teacher evaluation process can be positive, it can also take away local control. Without seeing what one might look like, it's difficult to rate.

Although it would possibly be hard to reach consensus, if there were an agreed upon system it could strengthen the process and therefore teacher quality.

An expectation that all teachers be regularly evaluated is great. But a standardized format for doing so is NOT a good idea. The needs and focus of evaluation vary from school to school. Standardization will only detract from the principal's ability to evaluate and goal set according to the needs of the student population, teacher, and school community.

An overall framework may be helpful, but anything more than that may interfere with the diversity found in specific learning communities and their individual needs.

Any consistency that we can bring to the profession, without losing what makes each school district unique, should be examined. A statewide model combined with training would be helpful as teachers and administrators move from region to region, as well as any state wide PD efforts.

As a district we have studied and are implementing Marzano's supervision and evaluation system and we are very impressed with its potential effectiveness.

As a fairly new principal, I think that it would lend clarity and consistency to the process. I also think that schools across the state are being compared and thus, common practices will help us build a state wide school system.

As long as the tool is of good quality, it would be fine.

As with so many things in our state, local control is a constant issue for things like teacher evaluation. Having a standard, mandated format might provide both the state and local districts with consistent, comparable information. For example, if a school now thinks that their teachers are excellent at DI/UbD and another school thinks they are insufficient and yet, they are in fact the same, it might inhibit effective professional development plans. At the same time I don't have a strong sense that this would create a substantial improvement of education in Vermont since the level of achievement will always be related to the goals and demands of individual communities/schools.

At Supervisory Union level, we are working on developing a district wide evaluation procedure that would be consistent in all of our schools. This helps us maintain our local control, yet have consistency from one school to the next.

Because each SU is a separate entity, I think getting all Superintendents, Principals and Teacher Union Reps to agree on a uniform of teacher evaluation would be very difficult.

Because of the unwieldy procedures we currently have, the district undergoes numerous grievances over staff evaluations. A statewide evaluation process would clarify expectations for everyone.

Calibration would be important.

Centralizing the teacher evaluation would make the process less effective.

Common language throughout the state could be helpful and professional development for evaluators would be nice. Vermonters like local control (so I've learned) and each SU might like the freedom to continue to develop a tool and process that is specific to them.

Consistency is always good.

Consistency across the state and elimination of local bias.

Consistency and equity across a small state can have its advantages. In our current state of economic constraints any sharing of resources to develop an effective evaluation process would be helpful. The hope would be if teachers clearly understand the evaluative process then the expectations for performance would be clear with professional development opportunities to follow, and perhaps even higher education curriculum would match these expectations.

Consistency is a good thing in general at the statewide level - makes principal's job easier. This district is using very similar format to my last district. This helps. It doesn't have to be a 1:1 correspondence among plans across all districts the state but similar structure with local adaptables is good enough. No system is perfect.

Consistency is helpful so that all stakeholders understand how evaluation is occurring and so that school comparisons can be made.

Consistency is necessary - an alignment of expectations and standards would be a good track to run on.

Consistency statewide is often a preference of mine in general.

Consistency would be good.

Consistency would be great, as long as the training is sound.

Consistent doesn't happen unless the same person is doing all the evaluations, which won't happen.

Consistent evaluation models would provide some important information for schools as teachers move from one school to another. With that said, what needs to be more consistent is the evaluator. Regardless of the tool/process, if evaluators are not intentional with their purpose and are not committed to improving student learning by their evaluations, the tool/process will not be beneficial to outcomes.

Consistent? Consistent for Pre-K, K, 1-2, 2-5, 6-8, 9-12? But things are different in a K-8, 5-8, 7-9, etc. So different it would be hard to make an instrument that was both generalizable and meaningful.

Currently there are too many variations in expectations, structures, and curricula to make a larger system usable. In a supervisory union we need not even agree on what we will teach, much less how.

Dependent on the quality of the measure and subsequent uses, etc.

Depending on who was involved in the decision making this might work.

Depends if the state continues to assume responsibility for more and more educational practices and policies. At some point education will either be a function of the state or revert to more of a local responsibility. The current hodge-podge is untenable.

Depends on the system which is used.

Each community has its individual needs and the evaluation tool would need to consider these issues. Also if a statewide evaluation tool then there should be statewide compensation/contract agreement.

Each district is different and unique, as are its students. A statewide teacher evaluation process would need to take into account the unique differences of each community.

Each school has a unique culture that should be treated with respect. While the standards for excellent practice are the same, the method of evaluating performance should respect the culture of each school. One size will not fit all.

Each school has its strengths and weaknesses as to how it gets its students to master the state standards. These may be affected by the student demographic, local economy, local job market, tax base, geography, etc.

Each supervisory union needs to be responsible for their teachers. I believe that when you try to get the state running something, things fall between through cracks and the level of expectation declines.

Evaluation is an intimate process between the evaluator and teacher for the express purpose of teacher improvement as they deliver instruction to students. Getting balanced and consistent training to teachers and evaluators on the use of such a system is



monumental. Considerable local efforts have occurred here recently to develop our system, and therefore it has "buy in" from the teaching faculty. Any system mandated from the state is likely to be viewed with suspicion. Models of acceptable systems of evaluation, with required components should be made available for local LEAs adoption and local modification.

For principals to make teacher evaluation the most important part of being an instructional leader then we need a tool that is clear, efficient and embeds professional growth.

GEs and NECAP tests have set a level playing field in terms of student performance. A consistent teacher evaluation process might standardize things further.

Great Idea - good teaching is just that good teaching, no matter where you are.

Having worked in four districts within the state, each has its own system for evaluation, with differing levels of accountability for teachers and evaluators, a consistent system would allow for equitable evaluation across the state.

I am always cautious of the "one size fits all" model.

I am concerned that a statewide teacher evaluation process may not allow enough flexibility for individual circumstances.

I am currently coming out of the classroom, as a teacher of twenty years, into administration. Each and every year I found areas I needed to improve in and will continue that framework as long as I am in education. As a peer of teachers who did not continue vital professional development goals, it was very discouraging, specifically if my students were placed in their classroom after a challenging year with myself and I saw their NECAP and other assessment scores drop. I was trained in the Danielson Evaluation Method and found it to be at the heart of what my expectations were for myself. The STA (union) is important. However, just as it protects excellent teachers, it also protects teachers who should not be in the field.

I am in favor of a state wide evaluation process. It would standardize evaluation of teachers, and promote criteria for effective teaching.

I am not sure if you could evaluate teachers who instruct in a rural small school compared to an urban large school the same way. In numerous ways, especially when the poverty rate is so high, instruction could be quite different.

I am open to this idea as I think most school districts that I am aware of use some variation of Charlotte Danielson's model so easy enough to adapt a uniform rubric and rating scale. However, I would want a lot of flexibility within the system to include narrative comments and specific examples of how teachers use curriculum, instruction, and assessment strategies to improve student performance. I have always been taught that

a checklist is meaningless unless there is specific and clear back-up describing why an area is a strength. I always like to provide to teachers clear descriptions of "what is working" so that they do more of that and focus their time and effort on doing more effective teaching.

I believe consistency is a great idea!

I believe that good leaders and qualified professional educators should be able to develop a functional model for supervision and evaluation that works in their local setting based on the environment, the climate and the professional relationships that are established in each school. A culture of continued growth and improvement should be emphasized at the local level with recourse to frameworks for collaborative practices such as Critical Friends Groups (CFGs).

I believe that our process is very thorough and serves our district well.

I believe that the Danielson criteria are enormously helpful in describing what good teaching looks like. At the same time the disparate size and cultures of our schools would make a uniform system less effective.

I believe that the process followed by this district to adopt an evaluation method is better because we have ownership and thorough understanding.

I believe this would make for a better understanding of very "clear" expectations for all teachers as they either stay where they are or move from school to school in the State.

I believe we have a quality system in place that works for X. It's not a one size fits all issue.

I don't have much of a comment. If it is a strong system that is not full of bureaucratic paperwork and can be used for growth, then possibly. I checked "Not Needed" because I feel our system is conducive to professional growth.

I don't think we all need to use the same model or process--I don't think that's important. The most important aspect of teacher evaluation is that administrators make it a priority and do it--and do it well!! Teacher selection, supervision, and evaluation should be high priority for administrators and there should be a significant amount of time devoted to it.

I feel that it is more important to align teacher evaluation to the work you do in your school and supervisory union, rather than aligning it to a state-wide process.

I feel that the freedom I have in my building to work with teachers on their professional growth works well for them. I don't want to enter into a system that has more controls.

I feel we should have a supervisory union wide evaluation plan, but not a state one.

I have been evaluating teachers for 29 years and in 5 school districts and have used numerous types of instruments. I have also been trained and re-trained to use the different instruments and can tell you that they don't all work and many were a total waste of time. My fear is that if the state had to agree on just one, people would make a mess of it!

I have no confidence that an evaluation instrument designed at the state level would meet the needs of our school better than the instrument we have designed ourselves combining Danielson's Framework and our own needs.

I have spent nine years in training and development on the current system in use based on Danielson's Framework for Teachers and am not excited about the possibility of having to move to a different system. It currently works well for me and my staff.

I have worked in a state that tried to implement this idea. However it was found that the local control issue was dominant.

I know there are better models for evaluating teachers and then using this information in a way to embed professional development. Our current model is not working here in this SU and I am not seeing the new leadership looking at this as something within her purview in the future. Therefore, perhaps a state tool, designed by a collaborative mix of stakeholders would be better. I believe we should have ONE teacher contract statewide, so a statewide evaluation model would dovetail nicely.

I often find that packaged evaluation tools are a good guide, but are frequently cumbersome and that the interval between evaluations does not provide the kind of on-going feedback that we get from our walk through observations. It is that kind of ongoing observation and discussion of feedback that results in more professional growth and positive change.

I think it is really important but also needs to be "administrator friendly."

I think it might be useful if it is based on Charlotte Danielson's work.

I think it should be up to each district whether they would like to adopt a new evaluation process.

I think it would be a real challenge to have one consistent evaluation model. Each evaluator draws on his/ her experience. Do we really want/ need a checklist? Is this like teaching to a test?

I think it would be helpful to have state guidelines and recommendations; however, a statewide system may be unduly influenced by political agendas, rather than current research on teaching and learning.

I think many have already moved to something very similar to Danielson. The reason I think it "might" be useful is because any system is only useful if people use it. It is very

challenging to stay on top of teacher appraisal, especially with the intense supervision that happens for new teachers the first two years. An efficient system that would be easy to use and easy to stay on top of would be meaningless. I have not seen clear research that the appraisal system itself affects teacher quality. Hiring practices, professional development, peer support, etc. all seem to have a greater affect on quality. Anyone can pull it together for a one time "dog and pony show" every three years!

I think student outcomes should be part of the process. Exemplary teachers who consistently provide exceptional student outcomes should not receive the same process as someone who does not.

I think that it has potential to be a good thing, depending on the process and product. Too often we are working on similar items and end up in similar places, but take up a lot of time, energy and resources. I do worry about when things become so big that people do not feel like they have a voice or are a part of the creation and revision process. I also wonder if one structure could serve all schools equally or if it would be watered down too much.

I think that the calibration of such would be necessary. It would actually be best to hire independent, state-wide calibrated people to do the evaluations for folks on improvement plans or nearly-there improvement plans.

I think that the Danielson Framework is a great evaluation tool; it covers all of the major areas of professional practice.

I think this idea is worth pursuing. Could it happen without a statewide teacher contract?

I think this would assist in creating a common language among school districts.

I would be concerned about consistent implementation.

I would hope it to be fair and appropriate.

I would like to hear more.

I would like to see this carried out but am concerned regarding the time element. I currently am a single principal (with an administrative assistant but no assistant principal) in a 230 student school with 50 certified and non-certified staff. I am the case manager of the Instructional Support Team (70 students) am responsible for meeting licensing requirements for a Before and After School Care Program and a Public Pre-K for 3 and 4 year olds licensed by Human Services, and also the operator of a non-transient public water system subject to EPA rules. I coordinate the school mentoring program. These are only a few of my must dos. There needs to be some understanding on the part of the rule makers and funding sources of the level of bureaucratic accountability I am subject to as well as the reporting out features newly mandated by the feds etc. This is not a large

urban school system with multiple personnel who can attend to these details. The responsibilities devolve upon me and my assistant.

I would need to be convinced that any state wide system is consistent.

I would need to review the process to know how useful it could be.

I would need to see details of any proposal in order to comment.

I would need to see the document and collaborate with colleagues.

I would really need to see the model to make a judgment.

I would want details of the "consistency" before I would commit to the usefulness of such a plan. I would also want to follow the background information used to base such a system on and the follow-up each year that would keep such a system running smoothly for the betterment of teaching and learning.

I would welcome a standardized evaluation process that would allow principals to collaborate as concerns arise and to ensure fairness.

If the evaluation becomes statewide, so shouldn't the pay scales?

If the process does not become a somewhat meaningless series of requirements outside the reality of daily applicable growth.

If the purpose is to determine merit pay, then this is a good idea. If the purpose is to improve teaching practices, than a situational approach with multiple models is most effective.

If the statewide plan exceeds the effectiveness of the local plan, then it would be an improvement.

If there would be consistent utilization of the common tool it would be great, however I can not begin to fathom a way that such a system would be implemented consistently...unless the state provided a team to do all evaluations!

If we could have a growth model for monitoring student success I would be far more inclined to trust a "consistent statewide teacher evaluation process". The thing about doing a so called "consistent process" is that it will also depend upon the individual(s) doing the evaluations and their perceptions of the process. Additionally, it could become extremely burdensome to some organizations where there is no support to conduct the evaluations. If I, as the building administrator know who needs attention, based upon student outcomes, classroom management and other issues, I should not be forced to spend time evaluating personnel that are excellent professionals. I have limited resources in terms of time. I believe in management by exception rather than blanket wholesale

programs which expend resources where they are not needed resulting in fewer resources available where they are needed.

I'm concerned with the current Federal/State views on education and would need to have clarity on the purpose of a statewide teacher evaluation process....the "ends in mind"...

Implementation in a consistent (calibrated) manner would be very difficult.

In the absence of such a protocol, I can't say that this would be a good idea. My standards are very high, and I would want such a protocol to reflect those high standards.

In Vermont, this could create some interesting dilemmas, the S&E model at X High School- the largest in the state versus X- a small one building school.... Not all areas will apply perhaps. On the other hand having a district wide process in our district helps. This would need strong leadership from the state, and strong buy in (which we may have with some supers and boards) and contracts that allow it (each SU has a different negotiated agreement with varying levels of directives regarding S&E.

Individual schools are responsible.

Inter-rater reliability would need to be part of the training.

Intriguing, including a more formal tie in with student results. Worth exploring. Demographics play a big role in initial student achievement. Would expect attention to be focused on core subject teachers. Non core teachers are not under the same scrutiny. How to increase their productivity so that it is comparable with classroom teachers?

It all comes down to finding a manageable process that helps teachers improve instruction. We should start with a statewide teaching contract, a state wide calendar, state wide professional development, and then look at a common evaluation process.

It could be helpful to have some consistency across districts especially given the frequency with which staff move between local districts. The difficulty lies in accurately describing different teaching environments or circumstances that would need to be effectively described with the same tool. I also see getting districts to agree to use and implement such a tool to be quite challenging.

It could be useful as long as it includes individual goals for self improvement and feedback from a variety of sources (surveys from students, parents, peers; observations and comments from administrators).

It depends on the tool and what it entails. As a small school, we may have circumstances that do not apply to larger schools.

It is a slippery slope unless all administrators state-wide are highly trained and provided with similar feedback.

It is hard to get consistency in our own SU with our own administrative staff. I would be concerned that consistency using agreed upon criteria on a state wide level would be impossible. Obviously, if this were ever to be considered it would take a tremendous amount of work working collaboratively with administrators as we all have our own system, criteria benchmarks. Other considerations, our system is set by Board policy and described specifically in the Master Teacher Contract. A state wide evaluation system would have to be considered during contract negotiation time (or simply mandated?).

It is hard to picture a common evaluation process that would work well in so many varied school environments and settings.

It is important to have consistency not only within a supervisory union, but within the state. (We do this for our students.) This can be quite challenging. In the big picture, as administrators, we need to ensure the importance for all teachers at various stages of development to grow and improve. Evaluation helps to look at best practices and examine what needs to be done to maximize student learning.

It may be difficult to come up with a practice that is realistic for all schools. For example, I have 94 professional staff which is a different responsibility than a school that may have 10 professional staff. If we have a statewide practice, we need to make it doable for all schools.

It might be useful for the general public in terms of consistent reporting standards. My concern would be that it subverts the individual school's or district's autonomy to select criteria for describing good teaching.

It might be useful to have a consistent evaluation process statewide for those teachers who have a tendency to change schools. However, I would struggle with the concept if it dictated an evaluation process based on level of performance. I have found that the narrative provides useful feedback for teachers.

It takes a long process for a supervisory union to create a useful evaluation tool. I think to have "buy in" you would need to have input for a lot of people. It would be challenging.

It would be a good first step towards a state-wide teacher contract.

It would be a good idea depending on the instrument and the process. If the process is based on student achievement alone that would not be a great idea especially if achievement levels were based on pre-determined and arbitrary goals.

It would be helpful to be consistent state wide for teachers and administrators. It would solidify the state's position on teacher excellence.

It would be nice to use the same tool. I would like to be able to rely on information from other principal evaluations from other parts of the state.

It would be wonderful to know that all our teachers were being measured using the same evaluation process.

It would depend on what model would be used to evaluate teachers. There are several good models schools in Vermont use that are research based already. Supervisory unions have spent a lot of time and resources to develop these as a tool in the evaluation process.

It would take a lengthy, open and detailed discussion to come to a meaningful resolution for a statewide evaluation process. If done correctly, it may be beneficial for improvement in the educational system statewide. If done poorly, or even with less than excellence, it may handicap those striving for more rapid improvement.

It's difficult to say. Especially with Unionized school districts, such as ours, there is significant disparity among schools. It would be an extraordinary challenge to develop a process that would meet the needs of such a diverse population of schools and teachers. If this were to proceed, my first question would be about the perceived value of a statewide system. i.e. What benefit would be achieved? If the answer is ultimately bureaucratic (e.g. ease of reporting to the federal DoE), then I do not see that a consistent process would be useful.

It's important to have common standards so that when teachers move from school to school, the expectations are the same.

It's not the tool that makes a difference but how it is implemented. What would insure that it is used with integrity across the state?

Let's get through the statewide calendar and teacher's contract first.

Local is the best.

Local school cultures and relevant issues would negate the process of a statewide system.

Many teachers move from one district to another in Vermont. If a consistent statewide teacher evaluation process is in place, the evaluations would speak for themselves in helping an administrator decide if the teacher is a good fit for our school. I know in the past some administrators won't give a verbal recommendation when calling past employees or they may not speak about all aspects of the teacher's real performance.

Might be useful to have a model policy with demonstrated success for districts to adopt. Might be useful, if we had a state-wide agreed-upon set of professional standards. It would certainly need calibration trainings.

Most schools I am familiar with use some version of a rubric of Competencies of Professional Practice with 4 Vital Areas. Such a system might be useful if used consistently statewide.



Must be research based program.

Need to see how it would be developed and who had input into its creation.

Not feasible. Remember the statewide calendar concept?

Not possible when it comes to implementation. Staffing is different. By the way, this survey doesn't work for me. I had to give answers to the last few to move on. Those answers aren't accurate. I'm new to the District. I have no idea how many teachers got what rating. The ratings were not overall. Also, teachers were only evaluated every 5 years in the past. Very uneven.

Not sure how a statewide system would work. Who would it be shared with, and what is the purpose?

One size never fits all.

One size only fits teachers within the "mode" and not the rest of the teacher population. I believe that the State would be better served to require each district/supervisory union to document the implementation of a rigorous supervision and evaluation model.

Only if there is statewide training in the process and follow up that everyone is using the model as it was meant to be used.

Our district uses a consistent process for supervision and evaluation. It brings common language to the district and allows for conversations regarding professional development.

Our evaluation process is currently in flux and is not effective at ensuring quality instruction due to the union's involvement in the process.

Our plan is useful for our district's small size and maximizes evaluator/teacher contact. Process should be able to adapt to the size of the schools.

Provided all administrators have similar training.

Regardless of where, the hallmarks of teaching excellence are the same. Having a uniform process might prove useful in helping teachers move from one district to another as well as a take away some of variations in evaluation across districts. By making the process consistent across the state, teacher candidates would know what expectations were wherever they were hired.

Since our process is tied to our school's action plan, a statewide system would get in the way of the action planning process. Also there would not be much trust in such a system. Evaluation is only as good as the evaluator and frankly state and federal resources are not

sufficient to support high quality evaluation. When it does happen it is the result of an individual's effort.

Since we have statewide teacher standards, it makes sense to use these as part of a statewide evaluation process.

Some folks who are prevalent in the field of assessment have posited that student success or failure is not necessarily attributed to the teaching. More importantly, education should be a shared domain between community and educator in order for students to succeed. For a most recent critique of American assessment practices, read Dr. Yong Zhao.

Some models are excellent and "work" for the school/SU. Everyone is stressed about the time issue and re-inventing or implementing a new model may not be needed in their school/district. It might be helpful if a model was available for those schools/districts that are looking for a better model than the one they presently implement.

Such a plan would be a political nightmare, interfering with other more important work.

Supervision is an essential in relationship to evaluation...

Systems that are adapted at the local level are more meaningful for both the evaluator and teacher.

The ability to standardize K-12 would be a difficult task that may not be needed. The outcomes may be similar but the methods for teaching vary substantially. This would make it difficult to create a standardize evaluation.

The Blue Ribbon Document is the most thoughtful and comprehensive evaluation tool that I have seen and used during my 30+ years of professional experience.

The concept would provide a common language for educators to use when discussing teacher performance. Such an initiative would require the skilled educator/evaluator for the leadership and guidance, follow-through and training activities. Professional Development Activities could be provided to match the areas of concern, need for growth or even provide a common arena for the instructors who excel. Hardship: There would be a tremendous challenge associated with training the observers/evaluators such that consistency would be the outcome. **(Same answer provided by 3 principals)**

The criteria for evaluation must be consistent, objective and well defined. I believe EVERY teacher should be observed yearly (perhaps more then once) and that their work in the classroom should be the primary source of their yearly evaluation. When we begin to understand that the objective is student learning and that the vehicle for this is predominantly classroom instructional performance, we will begin to understand the significance of instructional competence.

The criteria would have to be established to account for the different demographics, class sizes and levels of special needs inclusion expected in each school.

The degree and amount of work involved to institute such an undertaking would be significant and with the present state of economy costly.

The difficulty would be getting consistency.

The lack of consistency in evaluation is a problem.

The level of governance from which the evaluation system is generated is less relevant to attaining high commitment and performance of teachers than is the level of leadership within a building and the fidelity and commitment to ensuring that all students learn to high standards. A system at the state level at this point in time is very likely to be fraught with ennui and pro forma implementation.

The need for uniformity is important.

The state is too large and lacks the manpower to effectively implement something as important as this.

The teacher evaluation process is only as good as the people using it for each location. I have hired teachers who were not successful in other settings only to have them flourish here. The idea that we are all the same - even in this small state is a bit out of sync with reality.

The teacher evaluation process would have to be flexible enough to meet the needs of a variety of teacher learners, with a variety of skills.

The tool is not the problem. If there is a problem, it is in the user of the tool.

The usefulness of any evaluation process depends on the expertise of the person doing the evaluation.

There are aspects of our current system that I really like and I'd hate to lose the opportunity for thoughtful dialogue that is promoted.

There are clear, research-based effective practices that all teachers should be held accountable to.

There are too many differences in work requirements among schools--especially in terms of size of schools.

There are too many variables in a given school or classroom to apply a one-size-fits-all judgmental approach to evaluation. Evaluations should be used to improve practice by providing teachers with useful feedback or requirements for needed change. Effective

evaluation occurs frequently and within a meaningful context; not a one time written report about one observation on one given day by reducing the complexity of teaching to a numerical value.

There could be both positives and negatives. It might be helpful to have some consistency on guidelines. However, it would not be helpful if it was so structured that the evaluation couldn't be tailored to what the evaluator and the teacher feel are important areas to focus on. One of the main purposes of evaluations is to improve practice which in turn should improve student learning. If a required structure got in the way of this important dialogue and focus, I could not support it.

There is a tremendous need for a teacher evaluation system that is usable, useful and meaningful. Right now, teacher unions and past practice have defined the system so that is a blunt and unusable tool to promote excellence in teaching and to remove harmful teachers from an employment system. Very few administrators across the state effectively use the teacher evaluation system well enough to make a positive impact on the overall quality of a school.

There is an advantage of teachers who change jobs between districts. This allows them to know the model is being used and would help in transferring recommendations from one job to the next. There seems to be a need for a consistent evaluation system. At a recent VPA training on teacher evaluations, that was the collective thought of the group!

This depends upon the integrity of the evaluation process. We have a very formal process in X and I would not want to see this done away with unless the new process is as good as what we have. **(Same answer provided by 2 principals.)**

This may help with district to district consistency of performance and to have one plan that meets the needs of all students in VT.

This might be a good idea if everyone was trained to perform evaluations so that all evaluations could be performed "in the same manner." Also, it can't be cumbersome for the evaluators or the teachers.

This would be a difficult task because of the varied settings and expectations within districts. In an ideal world it might be great but how would you address mass professional development that would be needed to ensure consistency?

This would create a process that teachers and administrators would be familiar with as they change schools within the state.

This would only be useful if the results were available to potential employers.

This would provide consistency across the state.

This would require all evaluators to receive identical training, and for all educators to be made aware of this new process on a mass scale. It may be too difficult to tackle at this time when the DOE seems to be understaffed.

This would require training of all people doing evaluations of teachers - It would have to be benchmarked in some way.

To have a statewide process, supported by all parties, would make evaluations more meaningful to all stakeholders.

Transactional in nature. Implies further governmental intervention is in the offing in yet another arena of the once free public school.

Vermont teachers are expected to teach to the same standards. We are a state that values equity and are willing to (usually) do something about it. However, we always shy away from any political moves (such as a state wide teacher evaluation model, statewide curriculum, statewide calendar) that truly provide for equity. We should rethink this condition.

We are in a school of only 13 kids and 2 teachers. Our needs are very different than an urban school or much larger district school.

We are very happy with our current system so if a statewide evaluation process was comparable to ours we would be interested.

We have been unsuccessful with establishing a statewide calendar. I can't imagine trying to reach agreement on an evaluation process. Each supervisory union should establish clear and consistent research based teacher evaluations.

We need an objective and uniform approach so teachers are clear about expectations for effective teaching practices regardless of the school; evaluators would benefit from clear and consistent practices, opportunities for improving their observation/evaluation skills, readily available workshops.

We need something...

We set building wide goals that may be unique to each school.

We would have a consistent language and standards to rate teachers across the state. Sometimes teachers move within the state, so this would be a very helpful tool.

What is in place at our school appears to work for us in an effective manner.

Whatever it might be would have to be manageable and it would have to be doable.

While I am not necessarily opposed to one statewide evaluation model, I do not believe teacher evaluations and pay should be connected. This does not seem to be at all consistent with Vermont and how we do things. Too many variables and with our small schools, cohorts are often vastly different from year to year. I do see some value in one model...statewide training, sharing of practice between administrators, knowing the system when teachers from other districts apply.

While I know there are some really unmanageable and ineffective evaluations systems, I do not believe that having the state mandate a system will improve things. (At the same time, I would like to see evidence that it can work in Vermont.) Districts need to embrace a system that makes sense and works for their needs. The state must keep their focus on improving learning for all students, along a similar vein as its current process with NECAP. Where learning for all is not evident, mandates should be placed on schools/districts based on research.

Why? Unless we have a state wide teaching contract it seems like a waste of energy.

Would allow for greater level of consistency.

Would like more information on the model that would be considered.

Would need more specific information on the system to determine if it would be useful.

Equal is not always fair. Don't require us to use the same model because we can more easily extract data for state and federal reporting purposes.

I link specific evaluations to areas of identified needs based on school data or school professional development initiatives. This allows improvement efforts to be focused and relevant. When you move to a "one size fits all" plan- it becomes no more meaningful than "one size fits all" classroom instruction. Differentiation is key.

It has to be differentiated for staff members who are at different levels of experience and who perform at different levels.

I was the one who asked for a change when I became an administrator in 2000. I had been a teacher in X, and had two evaluations in 18 years, both based on a "checklist" system. I did not want to use it. We adopted Pathwise, and I pushed for the cycle to line up with the portfolio presentation so that it would all flow smoothly, but we ended up back at the 3 year cycle. I really enjoy the Pathwise model and find that the model works very well for any role, and for veteran as well as new teachers. It is helpful to have same model in all the elementary schools, as I can turn to my colleagues for ideas, questions, and support about implementation.

It is my professional opinion that a state-wide, consistent set of expectations, with the teacher evaluation standards defined, would ultimately lead to improved student learning.

One model statewide that takes into account student achievement outcomes is a very good idea.

I am intrigued by this idea and will be curious to hear what others thought. I am not sure that I have been able to think through all of the ramifications of this, but I think it has potential to be a good thing. I wonder if this can be tied into a conversation about statewide calendar????

I would be interested in pursuing a statewide evaluation system further. The disparity that I have seen across the state is amazing. Not only could a new statewide system raise the bar for teachers, it could raise the bar for administrators as well.

I would like to see statewide teacher contracts prior to having a statewide teacher evaluation tool. Without that, the statewide teacher evaluation tool isn't going anywhere, since every contract has different requirements about the teacher evaluation system. Additionally, if we did go to a statewide teacher's contract, I would vote to say that anyone who is on an improvement plan is the first to go in times of a RIF.

If a statewide system is considered people need to do them with diligence.

**Text Responses to Questions 20 and 21 (Do you have additional comments that you would like to share?)**

As an SU, X has just adopted an SU wide teacher evaluation system using Danielson's work as its basis. I think this is a sound system and will be easily implemented at all the various school district wide. Since this is my first year at this very tiny elementary school (we have 53 students K-6) it was difficult to address the history of teacher evaluation here in this survey.

As mentioned above, positive, clear and substantive feedback is what moves teachers (and students!) ahead. I am not in favor of a "cookie cutter" approach that provides no opportunity for a principal to give clear examples and provide supportive documentation of what teachers should be doing more of in meeting school expectations. The issue about including data is "what data." We all know from what is now a very substantive body of research that a teacher (nor a student!) cannot be judged by one test. It is a comprehensive portfolio of documentation and evidence that provides a complete description of student (and teacher) progress and strengths and weaknesses towards meeting a standard. We should not adopt what is clearly labeled as an ineffective and an inaccurate practice of one set of test results to judge the efficacy of a teacher.

As the principal I spend a great deal of time on supervision and evaluation and wonder about its effectiveness. I wonder if more time should be spent with less proficient educators and less time with more proficient educators.

Because we are in the process of creating a clear evaluation system, the answers to this survey will be different by next year. That's a good thing!

Creating and supporting a professional learning community can result in greater improvements in instruction than formal observations. Professional growth plans put the onus on teachers to develop their skills as they address elements of the school's action plan. Serving labor contracts and improving student achievement are two different things.

Current contracts are under negotiations. Principal for 2009-2010 is an interim and is asked not evaluate teachers formally, but is encouraged to observe.

Evaluations are needed and respected by most staff members. It is necessary to reflect on the year and create goals. This allows all to analyze the outcomes and the tasks involved.

For many years there was a lack of consistent application and administration of our evaluation tool. At this point, under a new central administration I feel as though we are on solid ground with regards to consistent administration and utilization of the tool to inform professional development as well as job performance rating.

High rate of administrator turnover has not led to consistency in the evaluation process. **(Same response provided by 2 principals).**

I am a first year principal and this will be the first year our veteran staff will be using peer/principal evaluation model. We are looking forward to examining our instruction practice in a collaborative way. I do not have information on the numbers of teachers in each category since this information was not left for me. I will be starting this year with a clean-slate.

I am an Interim Principal new to the system. I have answered the questions to the best of my ability but have just started the teacher evaluation process as of October 2009, and do not have access to past information.

I am looking forward to a more defined collaborative process with input by both teacher and evaluator.

I am uncertain about the use of the term "evaluation" in your earlier questions, as I believe you were asking about observations of teacher's teaching. This definition clarification would help me in completing this survey.

I believe the current model has been in place for about 5 years in this SU. It seemed fairly new when I came here 3 years ago. The model is a reasonable one in not being overwhelming for the administration nor too burdensome for the educator.

I feel our evaluation system is weak and doesn't meet the criteria which I would like to share with my staff. Teachers need to know what it is we are looking for and at when we do our 10 minute walk-throughs and formal observations. The language in the Danielson



rubric is quite clear and specific; it places value on the teaching experience and gives educators the goals necessary to challenge themselves in their field. Our current evaluation methods leave a huge gap in the areas of curriculum alignment to the Vermont Grade Level Expectations; understanding of teaching methods; and formal assessments created by the teacher. Finally, one of my current Action Plan goals relates to classroom management. Our Planning Room visits are out of control and each of us in the building need to take a serious look at the data and show responsibility towards the education of these students in our care. **(Same response provided by 2 principals.)**

I find that, as the only administrator of a preK - 12 school, it is a challenge to do faculty evaluation to the depth and breadth that I believe should happen. I am dedicated to ongoing, informal feedback, dialogue, and professional discussion intended solely to improve teaching and learning, and I am striving to balance that with more formal evaluation that is essential for other purposes, including raising the bar for those who do not respond to the ongoing improvement approach...

I have not used our system as I am new to VT. My previous district used a similar process. New research on supervision/evaluation (see Kim Marshall, Richard Elmore) has powerful implications for how we, as supervisors/evaluators, use processes for the development of our staffs.

I have successfully managed to dismiss a teacher here during my tenure.....it was a very involved, complicated, time-consuming process but I am confident, should the need arise, I can do this in the future. There simply are not enough hours in the day to do this job and if I were incompetent, many aspects of my job would never be attended to.

I want to mention the power of Peer Observation as a vehicle for strengthening collaboration within a school and a culture of professionalism.

I'm proud to say that in recent years our school has been very successful by most measures (standardized testing results, cost-per-pupil, community support, growing enrollment). Our teacher evaluation may have played a small part in this success, but only a small part...

Incorporating students' performance and achievement into the evaluation process has been a powerful tool in teachers' reflection on instructional practice and content. I think it adds objectivity to the process of evaluation and keeps the focus where it should be—student performance and growth.

It (our evaluation system) doesn't really work... it is missing a lot of pieces around assessment, group work, collaboration... it really misses the mark in terms of high school transformation.

Our evaluation system has been developed and refined over the past 5-6 years.

Our evaluation system is effective, promotes student learning and is revisited and revised yearly.

Our evaluation system was a consensus model in development and it tends to be cumbersome.

Our evaluation system was designed in collaboration with teachers and has been in place since 2004. Overall, we feel it is effective and helps improve instruction. Having a common definition of quality teaching practices has been helpful in both supervision and evaluation.

Our evaluation system works for us. It promotes individual professional development so the plans are personalized and relevant to the teacher involved. It also helps us develop district-wide staff development where appropriate.

It works. The teachers appreciate it because it is clear. The Danielson Rubric provides clear examples of what each level "looks like", removing as much subjectivity as possible.

It would be great if we could find a way to simplify the process while giving teachers good feedback along with a way to be accountable to the public.

I've been part of this supervision/evaluation process for more than 25 years...more than half as a teacher and for the past eight years as an administrator. Overall I would rate its effectiveness in improving teacher practice as "in need of improvement."

I've used several systems in the past. Too many become difficult to fulfill. The information isn't helpful to teachers. Danielson's model is good fodder for thought, but it doesn't translate well into practical help for teachers. It can become too big to manage. A system where the observer does a great job of recording what is actually happening and helps a teacher with his/her specific request -- am I asking HQ questions? Am I calling on students equally? How's my wait time? Those systems seem to give teachers much more help and guidance than the big, global ones do. Try to earn "exceptional" on a true Danielson rubric.

Last year our former superintendent implemented this evaluation system based on one that she found online. Although the system has the potential to be a good one, it is not fully developed and there is not a unified expectation for teacher performance due to the different tracks that teachers are placed on. It is not comprehensive enough and all teachers are not held to the same expectation, due to the different tracks that they are placed on. Our new superintendent is working on improving this.

No, other than that we are in the second year of a two year cycle with a new system.

One of the things that we have learned about our system is that it is not very responsive to our master teachers. In the current system they are treated in the same manner as a

teacher in their 3rd year. In short, their needs can be very different and should be acknowledged as such.

We are beginning this process, but not surprisingly it is a difficult one.

Our current system is likely to be refined in the coming year and beyond, as it is too time-consuming to be practical.

Our curriculum goals on local assessments provide data that compliments our curriculum strategies.

Our evaluation process includes too many sub topics. I think it is better to focus on 4-5 crucial elements of effective teaching. The self evaluation is a must.

Our evaluation system is in the process of being re-designed to be more useful and efficient. The evaluation process will focus on our action plan and strategic plan goals. The data gained from the evaluations will be used to drive our professional development needs, and monitor our progress in meeting our goals. I envision a model with frequent focused observations as opposed to a large cumbersome evaluation process completed every \_ number of years.

Our instrument is relatively new; we are in year three of implementation. This is my first year as principal at this school, following a principal who was very lax in evaluation. There is very little data on the ratings of teachers on the instrument from the past two years, and nothing prior to that.

Our supervision and evaluation model is fairly new to us. We piloted this model in 2007.

Our supervisory union is presently developing a consistent evaluation system that would be used in all schools within the SU. We will need to have professional development for administrators in order for the system to be equitable in all schools.

Our system is currently too cumbersome.

Our system seems to be more progressive than other districts. I feel very strongly we have a good evaluation process. **(Same answer given by 2 principals)**

Our system was developed supervisory-union-wide several years ago prior to my joining the supervisory union. I do not know its history in regards to development and adoption.

Our teacher evaluation process has been newly designed and implemented. We have no longitudinal evidence or data to share.

Our teachers had not been evaluated for 6 years. Last year I began with formal observations with all teachers, paras and staff. The teachers' contract requires annual

evaluations by principal. I want to do a good job with this because it is SO IMPORTANT but wish I could do a "two year cycle."

Staff enjoy the feedback on their teaching and are active participants in the process.

Student input is essential at high school level.

The ability and encouragement from the SU to make accommodations for our own local environment was important.

The administrative council worked together in the summer of 2008 to develop an SU wide evaluation process and instrument. We have worked since then to revise the process and consider it an ongoing process.

The administrators of this district will soon be revising the rating category such that it becomes a rubric rating. The evidence category, supporting the rating, is in need of revision to provide stronger and contemporary language, possibly in a check list format. **(Same answer provided by 3 principals.)**

The adoption process included thoughts and ideas from administrators and teaching staff.

The district reviews the evaluation system every few years and offers professional development as needed to administrators and teachers alike.

The eval model is new and currently implemented as a "pilot."

The evaluation system is a current document that was developed by a team of administrators and teachers within the district.

The model we have in place currently is not helpful in terms of increasing student/teacher performance, providing much needed mentoring, facilitating embedded professional development, addressing high-stakes testing and sharing a vision. I am open to something new, more comprehensive, research based and more realistic.

The PathWise system has too much paperwork. The strength of supervision is in the conversations. That should be a priority over the paper.

The process that I used for the past three years, from X County Public Schools in Virginia was a tried and true model that went through several changes, based on Jon Saphier's research. When I used it at X, for the past three years, I had no problems with it at all. It was created over time with teachers' and the union's input. It takes many years to develop a system that works.

The process that our district uses works. I have been able to identify the good, the bad, and the ugly. I have also been able to weed out the really bad and show them that

teaching is not how they should be earning a living. I also feel that this evaluation process has helped numerous teachers become better teachers.

The questions regarding the number and percentage of teachers in each level (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient or Distinguished) was impossible to answer given the question and the choice of answers. We don't give a final overall rating to our teachers. Those levels are used over the four domains with each domain having 5 to 6 subcategories that teacher and principals rate themselves on. So giving 100% of my teachers as "Proficient" doesn't mean that each teacher is proficient in all 22 subcategories of the evaluation standards. They maybe Proficient in many, Basic in some, and Distinguished in some.

The teacher evaluation process is time consuming and difficult to execute with consistency-especially in smaller rural school districts.

This is a new process that we are using for the second year.

This is my first year here at X after five years in another district in the state. I am not confident about the numbers in above questions because I did not conduct evaluations though there is ample documentation that teachers have been evaluated. It seems that this district has just recently adopted this model which is an adaptation of the Danielson Model. This model was previously adopted by my former district a year or so before I left. I was on the development committee for that process.

This is my second year at this school so I have not formally observed & evaluated all staff at this time.

This is our first year doing walkthroughs and getting into every classroom multiple times.

This is our first year of implementing the performance rating with teachers so the data I submitted for this survey is an estimation based on previous years evaluations. The principals, superintendent and other administrators in the district have been using the performance rating system for several years.

This is our second year of implementing this process in our SU.

This is the only district in which I have seen such a proscribed evaluation system. The result is that many loopholes are offered for under-performing teachers to grieve.

This process has been in use formally only two years to my knowledge.

Three years ago our supervisory union researched models used by other Vermont supervisory unions. As a result we planned and developed established protocols that are addressed in the teacher evaluation system following the Charlotte Danielson model.

Unfortunately it is a very timely process that does not, in my opinion, offer veteran teachers the information they need to refine their practice. I would rather video tape teaching, discuss strengths and challenges of teaching with peers involved, help structure professional development plans for future lessons, and create a feedback loop that lasts until the next formal observations.

We are attempting (at the SU level) to change the system to be "better" for teachers. We are attempting to use our assessment data (both NECAP info and OGAP info) to better match where teachers need to be with teaching and where students are headed with learning (as well as identifying the best paths to get students and teachers to attain the set goals).

We are currently considering changing our system to the Danielson model.

We are currently in the process of revamping the system slightly to improve our ability to use it.

We are currently in the second year of implementation and I believe this system is more effective than the previous system. Teachers are more involved in the goal development process and the entire system is more interactive rather than a unilateral administrative gotcha'.

We are due for a revision to make it more manageable and useful to all involved.

We are fortunate to hire teachers who are constantly trying to improve. They accept/welcome feedback from anyone--not just the Principal.

We are in desperate need of a complete overhaul to our system! We have been working on it/talking about it for years (under different Supervisory Leadership)... it is time for us to move forward with a more meaningful tool (both for teachers and for administrators).

We are in year two of our current plan. This plan much better defines the art and science of teaching through the rubrics which define each domain. It also allows for teacher reflection, growth, and ownership, which is critical for the continuous improvement process.

We are just beginning to use a Danielson based system.

We are looking to revise our existing model as it is cumbersome and lacks purpose. It needs to be more consistent, meaningful and useful as it relates to the alignment of instruction, assessment and the taught curriculum. Teachers currently set goals that are linked to action plans but all needs to be tied to IPDP, professional development, etc. thus creating a more cohesive structure.

We are revamping our existing system and hope to have a new one in place shortly.

We are trained and use the Danielson model. It has been very effective here at X.

We are working as an administrative team to constantly review and improve the process.

We collaborate with successful teachers setting goals for themselves.

We have a district-wide supervision and evaluation committee that reviews the process annually and suggests modifications based on feedback from evaluators and those being evaluated.

We have used this process for several years now and it appears to work quite well for us. We developed this system as at the supervisory union level and then tailored the form to our specific school. I like the process.

We used a SU wide committee to create our system. It was highly driven by teachers and has been useful in providing feedback and analysis to teachers.

I am new and do not know how evaluations were used in the past. Several required questions were not answered, so I created the following answers solely for the purpose of finalizing the survey so I could submit summative rating information.

As with any survey which involves simply checking boxes, this has some limitations. You need an explanation box for #5. I appreciate the boxes for some of the other questions.

For evaluation tools to be effective, there needs to be a system of on-going observations conducted by administrative personnel familiar with the grade level expectations, the standards, and with effective teaching practices, as opposed to a rotating schedule where some teachers are neither observed nor evaluated for a number of years.

A sound and viable evaluation system takes time and should be a dynamic process with the goal of a teacher's professional growth. I believe in a strong system but it should not require so much time that a principal cannot devote his/her attention to other responsibilities. Most of all, it takes commitment from everyone involved with a timeline, deadlines, and specific requirements for the evaluators to perform. If there is a weak link in the process, the process weakens. To have a strong process, it takes time and money to do it correctly. There should be curriculum specialists to observe teachers, and colleagues, in addition to the principal's or assistant principal's observations. The overall evaluation should be a combined effort of a curriculum specialist, colleague, and principal/assistant principal. In so doing, there are various perspectives all with the goal of growth for the professional.

I am new to this district and haven't had much experience with the Danielson model. However, the model developed by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is excellent and used in my prior district with much success as it was a collaborative effort between teachers and administrators.

I appreciate this survey being conducted. I feel it is important to encourage evaluation of teachers.

I do believe that teachers who receive less than an adequate evaluation or who are placed on improvement plans should have their names submitted to the Commissioner and should have particular standards that must be met prior to relicensing or moving from Level I to II or adding additional endorsement areas, etc.

I have a number of opinions on this topic, but mostly that improved teaching and learning is a combination of many facets, supervision and evaluation is only one part of this. I would like to share more, but alas, the pile on the desk is calling.

I work in a fantastic school. It concerns me greatly that small schools such as ours may not last much longer due to economics/consolidation. ARRA would have had a greater impact if it helped support what we already have (instead of--for example--extra Title I funds which must be supplemental).

I would like there to be a more equitable distribution of federal funds to meet the deficits created by unfunded mandates, a state negotiated teachers' contract, elimination of the 2 vote mandate for budgets, and for the Teacher's Retirement Fund to remain a responsibility of the General Fund and not the local taxpayers.

I'd like to know what other districts are using successfully...

On the survey itself, adding another question that would reflect schools currently implementing performance rating data would make the survey data more accurate. I did not want to select "no" on the question because that is not accurate (we are currently implementing the ratings this year). But when I selected "yes" I had to list numbers and percentages (so I estimated based on past evaluations).

Question 15 asked me to select all that applied in regards to how we use our aggregate results. We do not use them for any of the six categories; however, the survey would not let me continue with all six responses left blank. Therefore, I had to put a response that is not completely accurate. The survey question was written to allow for none of the above to be true, but the program was not designed to allow for a blank response to that question.

Re: Question 15 -- We use the individual teacher's goals to plan staff development, but they set goals within the context of our action plan, and it is the result of a school community wide collaborative process.

Recent best practices suggest more frequent observations by more than one person. Formative assessments are more helpful than summative. Team leaders should be part of evaluation discussions.



Since we have HQT teachers in our school the process of goal setting aligned with their IDIP and the Strategic Plan frequent conferencing with the principal renders our process a successful tool for staff development, team cohesiveness and good administration, teacher communication.

Supervision and evaluation is a very personal and intimate function of administration. Having the skills to finesse people toward making improvements in their practices has proven to be more effective to me than using a heavy hand or impersonal approach. I pride myself on having trusting relationships with staff and do not wish to use a more clinical approach.

It is clear from the questions that the ARRA money is framed, as always, around larger, more urban settings. For instance, reassigning teachers based on performance - that can happen in NYC or even in the governance structure in Massachusetts, but it can't happen in Vermont with our individual Boards controlling hiring and firing decisions!

The evaluation process is/ should be an opportunity for professional educators to reflect, discuss and validate what is/ is not happening in our classrooms. Regardless of the model there should be open communications between all and a clear understanding of the goal of the process.

We need to use a growth model for student success rather than the four current cut point AYP. It is a system designed to make schools appear to fail when in fact, real growth has occurred. There is no excuse for not using a growth model. We have the technology to do it and not doing so is far more a political decision than a decision based upon a desire to actually know how our schools are doing. We would like to know if people have been able to successfully include student assessment results in their models. We are also interested in how others may have connected the evaluation process to pay.

## **Text Responses to Principal Evaluation Survey**

### **Text Responses to Question 3 (evaluation specified by master agreement)**

Administration is not covered by any master agreement.

Contract links to Board Policy.

Have individual contracts--no union.

It's describes the roles of the administrator, school board and superintendent. It also states that a copy of the instrument needs to be provided prior to the evaluation but there is no prescribed instrument.

No. We have adopted XSU Guidelines for Supervision and Evaluation of professional staff (teachers) that applies to my S&E of all principals.

Nor should they! But, we have a very thorough supervision and evaluation process.

Some do.

There is no Master Agreement as the principals are not unionized.

We do not have a master agreement for administrators.

We have a mutually developed administrator evaluation system.

We have policy that governs principal evaluation.

The process is based on sound research and "best practice" models. It was developed collaboratively about 12 years ago, and undergoes periodic review. The same approach was used to develop the teacher evaluation system. There is a district Evaluation Committee that meets as needed to review and revise elements of the system. This is true for administrators, teachers and support staff. I am concerned about an earlier question about evaluation systems being in Master Agreements. I would never want to see the actual system in a union contract. A reference that we have a system and that is used well and fairly is fine. However, having the actual system/model in a collective bargaining agreement is unwise, in my opinion.

### **Text Responses to Question 4 (evaluation specified by Board policy)**

Administrative personnel developed an instrument for annual evaluation of principals several years ago. This is used in line with current district initiatives as well as supervision and evaluation. There is no Board level policy on this process.

Annual evaluations are expected to be reported to respective School Boards by March 1.

Format varies with Superintendent and even though contract specifies reviewing changes in format with the union, I do not believe this has been done. Has included achievements, goals, future goals, and challenges. I will use similar format, but will review ISLLC standards with each principal.

Some do. Our very small schools don't.

The process includes an annual evaluation of skills and work toward attainment of specific goals. The process is outlined in district documents but there is no policy.

They must be evaluated annually but the process is not defined. We use a protocol based on the ISLLC standards plus a narrative element.

Under Policy Governance this falls under the superintendent to administer.

Very brief.

We are Policy Governance and, therefore, Boards would not do this. Specifically, it is not a Governance issue, but rather an Administrative issue. We have a thorough set of administrator supervision and evaluation procedures (and for every position in the supervisory union) that are followed annually. In short, I perform a modified S.W.O.T. analyses with each administrator and follow-it up with a formal written, signed-off summative evaluation. In the process, I review the administrator's IPDP to ensure licensure compliance. The basis for the evaluation is whether or not the administrator's school has achieved its goals as they align to the Boards Ends, XSU Strategic Plan, and Administrative Cabinet Goals.

We have an Evaluation and Supervision of Staff policy that is general and covers all licensed professionals.

Yes, by reference to statutory requirements for superintendents. Practice here is annual goal setting, quarterly review of progress to goals and annual presentation of principal/tech center director evaluation summary to individual school boards in executive session. This is followed by board's determination of future year salary and benefits for the individual principal.

Our district utilizes a formal, standards based evaluation process that was designed to be consistent with that used to evaluate teachers. The document is extensive in scope, was designed with full participation of all administrators, and reviewed and accepted by the school board.

I put together materials from the following District Administrator Summative Evaluation; X Supervisory Union Principal's Supervision and Evaluation Timeline; Qualities of Effective Principals (Stronge, Richard, Catano); Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do (National Association of Elementary Principals); School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results (Marzano, Waters, McNulty);

## Assessing Educational Leaders: Evaluating Performance for Improved Individual and Organizational Results (Reeves).

It is a narrative that describes their responsibilities as the instructional leader and chief executive officer of their school, and they are evaluated on their goals, instructional leadership, supervisions and evaluation of staff, organizational management and student performance.

Job description coupled with 360 "Leadership Survey" based on leadership competencies from Vermont license endorsement.

Local model based on South Portland ME model also based on rubrics slightly revised from Danielson's work on professional standards. These parallel VT Professional Standards for renewal of license.

No real model.

Our model is based on Danielson and Saphier, in which both our teachers and all administrators have received professional development.

Observations, Meetings, Input from board members, colleagues, direct-reports. Completion of matrix of key leadership skills. Evaluation Conference. Goal Setting.

Principals are evaluated annually by the Superintendent based upon the following: 1. School and individual specific goals 2. Board feedback via Survey Monkey 3. Peer, Teacher & Support Staff feedback via Survey Monkey Superintendent receives written self-reflection from principal, summarizes and reviews all feedback with the principal, permits principal with opportunity to respond to feedback, and then provides written summary of performance.

Principals are evaluated on a skills checklist; both self-evaluation and evaluation by the superintendent are included. In addition each principal sets between 3 and 5 annual goals. Discussion of the work toward attainment of these goals is also part of the process.

Supt. meets with principals at beginning of school year to set goals, one of which must center around student performance. Supt. and principal meets at mid year to note progress toward goals. Two meet at end of year to see if and how goals were met. There could be carryover of a goal into the following year.

The evaluation aligns with the job description. In addition, principals write annual goals and are evaluated on overall performance as well as meeting goals. Principals also write a reflection on their goals/accomplishments.

### **Text Responses to Question 5 (frequency of evaluation)**

Despite the lack of requirement, I evaluate each principal annually.

Evaluation and Improvement Plans are treated separately. While evaluations are completed annually, Improvement Plans are much more detailed and specific to the individual and her/his required improvements.

For last category, as individual plan requires.

I am expected to evaluate each principal annually regardless of status or experience.

I am only REQUIRED annually... but when I had a Principal who was underperforming I did it more frequently.

IF a principal is on an improvement plan there would be increased supervisory meetings. These could be as frequent as weekly or more typically monthly.

In coordination with each individual's license renewal calendar.

No requirements; this is based on my own plan/practice.

Policy does not specify frequency; responses based on practice.

The distinction between supervision, which is regular and ongoing, and evaluation, which is summative, is not made in these questions.

The principal of X is informally evaluated continuously, year round. She receives a formal written narrative annually.

There are no separate formats for high performing or those in need of improvement. I would evaluate a Principal in need of improvement more frequently than once a year.

There is no policy or practice that requires me to evaluate principals on any particular schedule. This is not a requirement, but a practice.

### **Text Responses to Question 6**

As Superintendent of Schools I carry out the evaluation but others have input (Curriculum Coordinator, Special Education Director, Teachers, Parents, Staff, Students).

At the HS we used a Leadership Survey to gain info. From teachers. It is factored into the evaluation process.

I would be responsible but also seek input from other professionals.

In my last SU, I wrote all of the principal evaluations and was completely supported by 3/4 boards. The one that loved their principal wanted to see and approve the evaluation first and insisted I change or take out certain wording. I didn't have the power to not

comply. I have not experienced the process in this SU yet, but I foresee that the same thing will occur in one situation. It makes things extremely difficult as sometimes school district boards align with their principals which shapes the lines of authority.

Principal also does a self assessment.

Superintendent only.

Superintendent solicits feedback on principal's performance from School Board, Curriculum Coordinator, Special Education Director, Peers, and Teachers.

We have in the past done a 360 evaluation of principals by teachers, support staff and community members.

### **Text Responses to Question 7 (evaluation model)**

I meet with the principals to establish goals. I usually identify one that we will be working on as a district and then I may add others based on the principal. They add their goals (3-5). 2. A leadership survey is administered every other year to the teachers in the building. 3. I rate the principals on their level of achievement of their goals. 4. I write a narrative describing the principal accomplishments and a summary of the teacher surveys. 5. I identify strengths and challenges and make a final recommendation. 6. I discuss that work with the principal and then meet with the board in Executive Session where I discuss both the process and the products. The principal is invited to be part of that discussion.

All principals are evaluated yearly by the Superintendent. A summary and recommendations are then presented to each board. The evaluations focus on the following competencies, in addition to any other areas agreed upon, including individual goals set by each Principal: Resource Management; Student/Staff Management; Faculty and Staff Development; Parent/Community Relations; Instructional Leadership; Curriculum Program Management; Assessment Leadership and Management.

I am new to this position and there was no set practice in place. I am currently reviewing practices from several other SUs for implementation.

I currently use a self designed system of evaluating principals based on the ISLLC Standards (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium).

I evaluate principals with input from School Board, staff and faculty. A survey is conducted on each principal in January as one means of collecting information on the principal. Principals are evaluated using the following competency standards: Resource Management; Student/Staff Management; Faculty & Staff Development; Parent/Community Relations; Instructional Leadership; Curriculum Program Management; and Assessment Leadership and Management. Each of these competency standards have several components to them that principals provide evidence related to

during the course of the year. At the beginning of the year, principals also set goals with the Superintendent that are reviewed several times during the school year. A Summative Evaluation is compiled and reported back to the principal and the School Board in May/June.

In the past, I have asked the principals to do a self-evaluation. I have asked them to address educational leadership in particular as well as other areas of responsibility. I have then written a comprehensive evaluation (usually about 3 pages) which addresses their role as an educational leader (specifically curriculum, instruction, assessment, their teacher evaluation write ups, their involvement with their faculties in professional development, and more), their oversight of fiscal management and the facility, the role as part of the SU administrative team, their ability to problem solve and handle situations and parents, their role with the board. I am looking for a different model. I find it easy to evaluate a principal with good or excellent skills. If there is a principal that I do not find effective in particular areas who has the support of their board, it makes my job as an evaluator extremely challenging.

It is currently a work in progress. Last year, an attempt was made to use multiple indicators as leadership standards. However, more work is needed to make it relevant as an appropriate evaluation tool.

Principal performance is evaluated through collaborative, reflective practices and regular meetings with the superintendent. Individual performance concerns are addressed through corrective action and disciplinary processes that are parallel to those required for teachers.

Principals are evaluated annually by the Superintendent based upon the following:  
1. School and individual specific goals 2. Board feedback via Survey Monkey 3. Peer, Teacher & Support Staff feedback via Survey Monkey. Superintendent receives written self-reflection from principal, summarizes and reviews all feedback with the principal, permits principal with opportunity to respond to feedback, and then provides written summary of performance.

The superintendent evaluates the principals annually based on the goals, instructional leadership, supervisions and evaluation of staff, organizational management.

The superintendent meets monthly with the principals in order to check progress on meeting annual goals.

We use a conference and self evaluation followed by the superintendent completing a rubric dealing with 15 areas of professional practice with a narrative for additional areas for strengths and topics for further discussion.

Each principal is evaluated annually by the superintendent. Multiple inputs are used which range from self-evaluation to surveys, where appropriate, to observations,

interviews and record reviews. A summative report is written and reviewed with the principal.

Each year, the principals set goals with the Superintendent. Two goals are developed by the principals, one or more is from the Superintendent, depending on what the needs of the principal or the school are. Weekly meetings are held for general discussions and periodic checks on progress toward the goals. A year-end evaluation is written using the goals as a measure.

Evaluation is based on compilation of pre-determined annual goals and a review of the job description.

Principals are evaluated annually in each district. The Superintendent meets with the Principal to set goals at the beginning of the year. These goals are then evaluated collaboratively during the year. At the May school board meeting, written summative evaluations based on the performance goals are reviewed with the school board. Professional goals determined annually as well as directives that I may have assigned predicated upon prior evaluations and/or building related program and/or service needs and initiatives--Performance factors relevant to a specific administrative role are also used in conjunction with observations and feed back from those impacted by the administrator's job description-- Sept- June: meet with individual principals monthly to discuss progress on goals, focus areas, improvement plans March- April: get input from board members regarding principals' performance May: distribute 360 survey to all principal's direct reports July: distribute 10-point matrix outlining key leadership attributes to principals for completion by them and by me (for each principal) July-August: meet with individual principals to review survey results, board input, my observations and to review the matrix that we've each completed and to compare notes. At this same meeting, we discuss areas to be included in goals for the following year Sept. - Oct: principals submit goals for the year.

Superintendent evaluates principals annually with input from the school boards.

Supt evaluates based on goals and vision for the school.

The Boards expect the Superintendent to evaluate principals each year. I use an instrument for the evaluation process that I developed four years ago. I would be glad to share that form with the DOE.

The principals set yearly goals and meet with the Superintendent to collaborate on the goals. There is then an end of year review of the goals where principals must bring evidence to support their meeting the goals.

A local model that has been derived from business. It uses a S.W.O.T. analysis coupled with a formal written summary and is based on desired organizational outcomes.



A process of self-appraisal combined with supervisor appraisal and feedback from school board where appropriate.

Adaptation of the model produced by VSBA.

All of our schools use the Charlotte Danielson model.

Based largely on Charlotte Danielson's work, it is a standards based model.

Based on ETS Pathwise publication of "A Framework for School Leaders."

Based on ISLLC standards.

Based on ISLLC Standards.

Committee working on a national standards model with rubrics.

Do a narrative summary based on their job description and annual goals. Each administrator develops goals at the beginning of each year. They are monitored with evidence of achievement reviewed before contract renewal. We use a 360 eval process to provide information to administrators from their stakeholders, to give feedback on communication, leadership, advocacy, knowledge of teaching and learning, and professional behavior. Annual written summative reports are reviewed and filed.

Evidence-based evaluation on a rubric across 13 domain areas.

Goal setting.

Goal setting annually, with self-evaluation written in spring. Superintendent then writes a summative report. A corrective action plan would be put in place if necessary.

Goal setting at the outset of the year Development of Action Plan to meet goals Quarterly meetings to review goals progress (Mostly informal) Monthly meetings to see how things are going in the school.

Goals are set collaboratively with the principal and school board. The Superintendent and Principal meet regularly to check in on progress. The SU also has an administrative leadership team that collaborates on projects and problem solves issues. By May of each year a narrative is written for a performance evaluation and shared with the school board.

Has included achievements, goals, future goals, and challenges. I will use similar format, but will review ISLLC standards with each principal.

I have developed a comprehensive tool that has a goal setting component, a formative evaluation based the National Standards for School Leaders (ISSLC), and a summative rubric used as a self evaluation as well as completed by the superintendent. I also created a board members feedback survey, a staff feedback survey, and climate surveys for

parents, students and staff. The timeline is March to March. Goals are set each late spring/summer for the following year. The process is a 360 evaluation that takes into account the daily grind responsibilities and the innovative Creative parts to leadership.

The following eight Vital Areas with a scoring rubric of Competencies of Professional Practice frame our annual summative evaluation model for principals: 1. Develops and manages a fiscally responsible budget that supports high student achievement 2. Manages school to create a safe, friendly and productive environment for all students 3. Attracts, supports, and develops an effective faculty and staff 4. Creates positive relations with parents, businesses, and the community that support all areas of student learning 5. Supports inclusion and works to guarantee equal student access to learning and student programs 6. Designs instructional strategies to support high student achievement in very diverse classrooms 7. Manages curriculum so that all students have the opportunity to meet or exceed challenging standards 8. Manages assessment activities in the school that will show evidence that students are achieving very high standards.

The form is divided into six sections each related to student success. The sections are: Shared vision; Culture of Learning; Management; Family and Community; Evaluation; Board and Central Office Relations. The instrument works well with the teacher evaluation form we use (path wise model of Charlotte Danielson). I developed the administrator form from combining forms from about eight states.

The model is based on state standards for principal performance and progress to annual and long term goals. Formerly a 360 process was used. Our evaluation system for teachers and principals is under review this year and will be revised to align with our curriculum, instruction and assessment system for implementation in fall 2010.

The model was adapted from the national standards for principals.

VSBA Model, 360 Process, Self-Evaluation, Narrative.

We have a local model based on the system used in Iowa. They system used the ISLLC standards and performance expectations as the basis for reviewing performance.

We use a conference and self evaluation followed by the superintendent completing a rubric dealing with 15 areas of professional practice with a narrative for additional areas for strengths and topics for further discussion.

We use the supervision and evaluation standards from Research for Better Teaching We use the Vermont Classroom Observation Tool (VCOT). The principal is asked to evaluate teachers using this tool and the needs of the building for coaching or professional development are organized around the findings. Supervision of instruction is the primary focus of principal evaluation.

Yet to be determined.

The process is extremely comprehensive and involves the completion of a self-evaluation, writing of a personal growth plan, discussion with supervisor, and an end of the year discussion. In the third and sixth year of the individual's licensing cycle, administrators are required to include a staff survey as well as a survey of students, parents, or colleagues.

The evaluation tool provides consistency and clarity of expectations. However the true value of the system in our district is the goal-setting process with our principals and the alignment of those goals with our school action plans. Our supervision process consists of monthly learning walks in each of our schools followed by consultation time with each of our principals to calibrate on the vital areas within our summative evaluation plan. The process and the communication involved within it is what makes this process so valuable and equitable. The simplicity of the tool with eight identified Vital Areas and the scoring rubric identifying the competencies of professional practice, along with the established process creates an environment of collaboration and continuous improvement. The role of a school principal is incredibly complex and although data informs progress it must be balanced with frequent on-site observations of the school in action.

The process requires identification by the principal of the evidence for meeting the proficient benchmark. The principal is offered the opportunity to represent themselves with the evidence they collect to meet the descriptors. We've been using the system for the last few years and the principals are getting better at noticing when they are using best practices.

The Vermont Classroom Observation Tool was developed as a result of leadership work done by the Vermont Institutes and has been used in national research and international settings to measure and describe teaching practice. It has correlated well with student achievement data. (See Mathematical Policy Research, Inc. reports on Teacher Preparation and Teacher Induction).

### **Text Responses to Question 8 (domains included in evaluation)**

Board relationships, understanding the political climate, various things depending on the principal. I only address ethical practices if there is a problem. I don't wait to the evaluation. I address it as soon as I see a problem and work with the principal until we resolve the problem in a way that works effectively.

Collaboration with other schools (K-12) within the supervisory union for shared goals and student achievement.

Could be any of the above that are mutually agreed to.

Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Support of inclusionary practices Budgeting/  
Fiscal Management Hiring and Retaining Quality Staff.

Effective management of financial resources (local budget and grant funds).

I plan to include all the domains listed above.

Interaction w/ Larger political, social, economic, legal, cultural context.  
Not all domains at all evaluations, however.

Ours includes all of the topics above.

School finances and operation of building.

Supports inclusion and works to guarantee equal student access to learning and student programs. Develops and manages a fiscally responsible budget. Attracts, supports and develops an effective faculty and staff.

While "all of the above" are part of the holistic summative evaluation I write up at the end of each year and are used implicitly, the focal point of the evaluation process is the mutually agreed upon performance goals and accompanying action plan.

**Text Responses to Question 12 (how evaluation informs principal of his/her performance)**

A self-reflection using the Danielson rubric in our guidelines for teacher evaluation is also required.

Adjectives used in the description indicate the level of performance.

Based on annual goals and whether they were achieved.

Each standard has descriptors of evidence in that area with narrative commentary from the Superintendent with suggestions, recommendations, commendations, and directives as necessary within each Standard Component Area.

Feedback concerning progress toward individual goals, school action plans and supervisory union long range plan.

Growth plans which focus on particular goals are developed and reviewed at supervisory meeting along with evidence of practice in the standard areas.

I would like to include a "360" this year. I have not done one for principals and would like some examples or a model.

Ratings are: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and exemplary and are assessed across each of the principal's 3-5 goals. In addition I write a narrative which culminates in a discussion of strengths and challenges.

Reflection by the principal rationalizing the findings.

Summative evaluative statements are made across all domains with a final summation addressing recommendations and commendations.

The descriptive narrative details "Strengths of Practice" and "Areas for Continued Attention and Discussion" based on the ratings across the 13 domains. It is here that the overall performance is summarized.

The Principal is required to collect anonymous feedback from the faculty using a tool of their own design and asked to share the general findings with me. We also conduct an annual parent survey with a rating scale for the administration and the opportunity to provide open-ended feedback. I also make an effort to walk around the school or attend a faculty meeting to see how things are going.

### **Text Responses to Question 13 (use of student assessment results in evaluation)**

A variety of student performance measures are used as indicators of progress towards meeting specific professional goals. The measures used are mutually agreed to by me and the principal as we find appropriate for each goal.

Analyzing data happens at administrative team meetings with the expectation it will happen within each building. I do know that it occurs as I sit in on the as many of these meetings as possible. I do not hold principals accountable for student results, but do expect that they are working with their teachers to use formative assessment and to analyze data like the released tasks from the NECAPs.

As part of the process principals set goals in the beginning of the year and the Superintendent meets with them monthly to monitor. At least one goal must be directly tied to improved student achievement. They must provide evidence of both action steps and improved achievement.

Data is used but not be specific scores, ranges with improvement targets tied to performance.

Each year we review our assessment results but particularly those areas where we don't meet AYP. We have been identified under school improvement level 1. Over a period of time we expect that principals will develop an action plan to address the areas identified. Principals have been cited for not properly addressing the areas of need in their evaluations.

Only the state assessments and AYP are generally discussed. In schools, where they have not met AYP, what they will do differently to improve the scores is generally a goal. Multiple assessment data is considered as part of student achievement and school performance indicators.

Not as specific as described above.

Not at this time, but is discussed in conference with each principal.

Not specifically - though we do review student performance as part of the action planning process and that is part of the discussion during the principals' evaluation conferences. Reference to student performance and school goals are linked to measurable performance gains, therefore they are related.

References NECAP aggregated and growth data.

Sometimes, if this is a goal the principal is working toward formally.

Somewhat if identified as a goal.

Student assessment data is reviewed regularly and targets for improvement are set for schools. Progress toward meeting those targets is considered as part of the evaluation process.

Student data is considered in the categories of effective learning climate and curriculum; in this way it could affect the categorical evaluation which is based on a performance rubric, but it is not a discrete weighting factor in and of itself.

Students' assessment data is reviewed constantly at the XSU. We have an extensive student performance data system that tracks students longitudinally. Concerns in this area are dealt with systematically by the administrative cabinet as an entity. If there was a longitudinal issue of performance in one school it would be included in the Principal's evaluation, but I do not (and have not) had that problem arise.

The NECAPS are completely worthless as a measurement for our school since we score very high. Most off-the-shelf tests do not lend themselves to this kind of measurement. Researchers have warned against using tests for measuring teacher performance or school performance with a single indicator. Don't get me started on this issue!

These data are reviewed and analyzed but do not necessarily correlate to performance ratings due to the complexity of the work.

This is true of 1 of 4 schools in the SU.

#### **Text Responses to Question 14 (how weighted)**

Again, this system is not in place but I would expect to use student assessment data as part of my evidence for success.

However, in schools where they have not met AYP and improvement of test scores is a goal, implementing a plan is more than 50% of the rating for that goal.

I really cannot put a weighting to student assessment results and progress. It is part of the overall performance. If there is an area of weakness, we focus on that area.

Student performance indicators are heavily taken into account, but our guidelines do not call for a fixed percentage weight.

**Text Responses to Question 16 (statewide evaluation process)**

A base template with options for local initiatives might be a good idea.

A consistent definition of components of effective instructional leadership and school management would be helpful. The process must vary depending on a wide range of school-specific characteristics and priorities.

After you tackle a statewide teacher's contract, a common teacher evaluation tool, and consolidation...go ahead.

An effective principal evaluation system must correlate to school and supervisory union strengths, needs and challenges. Also, goal setting is critical even for the experienced professional to maintain their currency in the field and to provide them with opportunities for growth through mentoring opportunities across the SU as well as leadership and advocacy opportunities outside of the SU.

At least I don't believe it is needed for me. We use a system that I think is fair, thorough, and provides feedback allowing principals to grow and improve. I worry about a state system being mandated that puts too much emphasis on things that already have too much emphasis i.e. standardized test scores in a couple of subject areas.

Depends on what it is and if it fits our definition of leadership.

Each building situation requires a specific set of leadership skills that aside from what is essentially required for state certification is essential to that particular learning environment--Unless you are just evaluating what is essentially required to be a principal or other type of building administrator, a state wide principal eval could not effectively assess the particular needs of a given school environment re leadership--evaluations are a local responsibility based on values goals and visions that vary from one school to the next.

I am unsure about this idea. All schools are different and the relationships between principals, superintendents, and boards vary.

I don't see that there is any useful purpose in requiring the use of a statewide process. In our case, we have invested a significant amount of time and energy to develop our system. Our system is also used (with a number of significant differences in standards and descriptors) for our teachers and nurses. It is meaningful and useful to us.

I have worked as Superintendent in a variety of school districts over the past 25+ years and know that each district has its own culture and expectations. AS LONG AS VERMONT PERSISTS IN ALLOWING LOCAL CONTROL, it should persist in allowing local Boards and Superintendents to define the parameters they wish to use to measure performance of administrators... I concur with those who believe the current governance structure in VT is obsolete. Having worked as a county Superintendent in MD, where there are 24 Superintendents for the entire state, and as an SAD administrator in ME, where geographically proximate towns are aligned in districts governed by a single Board, I believe that VT should give serious consideration to some form of consolidation. I would hold off on any efforts at implementing State-wide evaluation models until the governance structure is addressed. There are only so many hours in a day and so much political capital... the tough nut to crack is the governance one!

I see this as a high priority for our state. I do believe the process should be consistent within the supervisory union, as it is in mine. I have been the recipient of a professional evaluation via a state-wide form (NC) and was unimpressed with its implementation or effect. It seemed like a waste of time and effort.

I think the idea has merit although the specific school districts in Vermont have a huge variety of size, student needs, and community needs. There would have to be some way to individualize a statewide practice.

I would be interested in developing a state wide evaluation system. I think it could be useful to enhance our current tool.

I would just want to make sure that the plan that was developed was based on what is most likely to result in improved leadership capacity and not on what is most easily measured and what can work most easily at the macro level.

I would need to know more. Our model and the professional development that supports it is working. I would worry about a different approach that might upset a sound system. As always, improvement can be sought.

I would want evaluation models to be reviewed for consistency and effectiveness.

I'd like to see a priority given to teacher evaluation first. I've worked in my district for the past two year to institute a new teacher evaluation model based on the Danielson approach. This would be a greater priority than principal evaluation.

If I have some input into that process, it is a good idea. I believe in evaluation for all of us and I lament that we do not deliver corrective messages effectively. Too many processes are only rubber stamps of excellent. We must learn how to give and receive corrective action recommendations.

If it was standards based, had rubrics, was instructive and informative to the principal and doable to implement it would be acceptable.



If there is statewide agreement on the purpose of the evaluation process and it is focused on realistic and attainable goals that are uniformly held across the state, it may have potential. That potential will not be realized if the system that is developed does not enjoy widespread understanding and support. Any process is only as good as how it is implemented. There are a variety of issues that need to be addressed - what is the role of the state in determining an evaluation process for principals? Why is the state moving into this area when the same opportunity exists for it to develop a similar system for teacher and support staff?

In Vermont, we cherish the uniqueness of our schools and communities; however, evaluating principals should have some consistency state-wide.

It is a fair idea. OUR STATE CANNOT ACCOMPLISH THE TASKS IT REQUIRES OF US NOW. IT WOULD BE REALLY STUPID TO REQUIRE ONE MORE THING THAT WE LACK THE RESOURCES TO ACCOMPLISH.

It is an excellent idea if it is a good instrument. If it is not, it is a very bad idea.

It will be helpful to maintain consistent quality of administrators and help to justify needed increases in salary to keep good administrators.

It would be helpful to have a consistent standard for all principals, if it is the right tool.

It would be nice to have a consistent statewide model.

Its usefulness depends on the quality of the evaluation process.

Might be a good idea if there is input from supts. along the way. Anything from "on high" is suspect.

X is different than other parts of the state and those issues need to be considered. A State Board Rule should address the content and frequency of evaluation.

Only if it was based on an agreed upon set of standards for principal effectiveness.

Principals travel around our state frequently from job to job. It would be good to have an actual measure of their effectiveness when considering job applicants.

School districts and towns in Vermont vary too widely for a single boilerplate style evaluation. The principalship is a very personal and culture oriented position.

Since there are common statewide standards and a common assessment, calibrating on a common tool for principal evaluation makes good sense. However, our schools are so diverse across the state; I believe the role and expectations of the principal varies significantly in communities across our state.

Statewide systems don't work very well. They are too far removed from the field. I believe a series of supervision and evaluation models collated and provided as guides would be useful. I believe for a supervision and evaluation system to be effective and meaningful, it needs to be personal and tied directly to the desired outcomes of the organization.

The DOE needs to stay out of the role of local school boards.

The evaluation procedures for both teachers and administrators are neither valid nor reliable as tools for valid assessments of job performance and would interfere with the attainment of improving staff and student performance instead of supporting them.

The governance structure in this state could not support a statewide process.

The wide variety of governance structures produces a huge variety of job expectations by communities, school boards, and superintendents. Until the job expectations are consistent, it would be difficult and unfair to attempt a consistent evaluation process.

There should be no debate on what skills an effective principal possesses.

This will only be effective if the district school board does not have the power to change an evaluation or pressure the superintendent to make certain that the evaluation comes out as they wish. It is sad when this happens because board members do not have the expertise needed to make some of these decisions, and are blinded by principals' relationship with them. I do believe that it is important that the principal has a good relationship with their board, but it places the superintendent in a difficult spot because the superintendent answers to the SU board and not the various district boards.

This would be excellent if it were based on student growth and on not violating guidelines. (Policy Governance format.)

This would depend on who established the evaluation format. We are looking at a new model that works for our SU. I do not feel we need this level of micro-management.

Unless there were State issued contracts or a State compensation system, I do not believe a State wide evaluation system is needed. However, I have attended conferences where Superintendents share Principal evaluation models and supervision models which are always helpful.

We do need to start building more consistency into the process.

We have a great document and a fine process as a small district--with high standards built in--don't want it weakened.

Why is such a system necessary other than to navigate the whim of federal policy? If we were to design a system that was focused on improving instruction in a school, it is doubtful it would include vertical integration with schools throughout the state.

### **Text Responses to Questions 17 and 18 (additional comments)**

360 has been used in the past. Board members got involved. This was not productive. Some board members still request a 360 and superintendent steers the board away from this practice.

Historically, our profession has done a terrific job of evaluating all administrators, including the Superintendent. We deserve whatever criticism we get.

I am disdainful of checklists. They are reductionist and imply that satisfactory attainment of a series of items drawn from "good practices" will yield satisfactory performance by an administrator. The effectiveness of an administrator has MUCH more to do with HOW they accomplish tasks than the tasks they accomplish. I am a great believer in listening and chatting... I get more insights on how an administrator is doing by listening to teachers than I get from a survey. I also believe that formative feedback is superior to summative feedback... When a tough issue emerges it is best to deal with it immediately and not allow it to fester. I also think that encouraging reflection by the administrator is far more valuable than making unilateral judgments. The best administrators know where their weak points are and have a good idea of how best to address those weaknesses. Finally, if a principal is NOT measuring up, I believe in documenting the problems, offering help, and if that help is not accepted or does not yield improvement, advertising for a new administrator.

I have found that a supervision and evaluation system is most effective when the participants take some initiative and stake in the process. Effective evaluation of professional growth is not a passive process dependent on a superior's wisdom, but a collaborative and developmental pursuit of excellence engaging both the superintendent and the principal in building trust and confidence in each fulfilling their proper roles on the supervisory union's administrative team. This also holds true for the supervision of teachers, and I find it helpful for the principals to experience the evaluation process both as the supervisor and the supervised. S&E should bring us all together as professionals to improve our professional reflection and practice. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are an increasingly important element in the professional growth of my principals, teachers and central office staff, including me. Participation in a PLC is a universal expectation across our supervisory union.

I listed an above under the administrators in the different categories because this is my first year in the district, I just finished the principal's evaluation tool, process, and timeline and the administrators here have not been evaluated in many years, if at all.

I think our system works fairly well. I meet monthly with principals to hear how they are doing in meeting the goals they have set for the year. I also ask them to share their goals with their board and ask boards to provide feedback as I am completing evaluations.

I would gladly share with you the protocols, forms, and samples of completed evals. Otherwise, I find this survey a complete waste of time (I don't mean to be rude, but rather factual).

In the past, we have changed principals every two to three years. There was never time to develop any form of developmental evaluation model for this position. Presently, we have a superintendent and principal that worked for years together as teachers and work closely with one another today as an administrative team. In short, the principal hears about any problems or issues immediately, though usually informally.

It is in need of revision.

It really needs work and the work is important.

It seems to evolve each year. I would like a more systematic way of doing these evals that move district initiatives forward and involve more input. Thanks.

Moving toward a rubric standards based assessment tool for 10-11SY.

MY BOARDS JUST WANT TO KNOW THAT I DID THE EVALUATIONS AS LONG AS THEY THINK THE PRINCIPAL IS OK.

My system is under construction.

My tenure in this district began July 1 '09. The supervision and evaluation practice has been inconsistent and at times infrequent, but this is not unique to this district or State.

Our process is in transition to include more peer input and evaluation.

Our system is in its second year and to a large degree mirrors the professional development and evaluation system that was designed for our teaching staff a number of years ago.

Our system was implemented last year for the first time so we are still refining it.

This is the first year that our principals will be using this new process and my first year as Superintendent of Schools so it should be interesting to find out at the end of the year whether people feel this process is useful or not.

We have one less administrator this year due to the consolidation of schools and also three of our principals are new this year.

When I arrived three years ago, this system was in place. I continue to modify the teacher survey - I think there is room for improvement on that document. I would like to add student outcomes in a way that is fair to all. The reality is that if student outcomes are an indicator, there is one principal who will always do well because of his population. Success will be more elusive for those principals who work in town.

We are indeed fortunate in this district to sustain leadership at the principal level, one of the most crucial elements of school improvement. I believe our evaluation process provides the necessary collegial support and creates a professional learning environment that attributes to the retention of our principals and the quality of leadership they provide on a daily basis.